DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 514 FL 012 867

AUTHOR Nederveen, Paul
TITLE Teacher Job Satisfaction and Modern Language Curricular Variables in Alberta.
INSTITUTION Laval Univ., Quebec (Quebec). International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
REPORT NO ICRB-B-112; ISBN-2-89219-114-9
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 176p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; Classroom Techniques; *Cultural Influences; Curriculum Design; *Job Satisfaction; *Language Teachers; Second Language Instruction; Sex Differences; *Social Influences; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Influence; Teaching Experience; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationship between the modern language teacher and various curricular influences. The effect of these influences was specifically examined in relation to the teacher's level of job satisfaction. The literature review explores research on job satisfaction generally, teacher job satisfaction specifically, and studies concerning teacher attitude and the personal and situational factors acting as curricular influences. Initial analysis of a questionnaire provides a description of the sample (365 teachers), measures of job satisfaction, and rating for each of the curricular influence items by their means. The analysis discloses four correlations between job satisfaction and personal factors. Female teachers were generally more satisfied than male teachers. Non-foreign language specialists were more satisfied than foreign language specialists. Significant positive linear relationships existed between job satisfaction and age, and between job satisfaction and total years of teaching. The responding modern language teachers showed a high level of job satisfaction and their overall response indicated concern with specific curricular influences, significantly related to job satisfaction for three-fifths of the items, and identifiable by factor analysis. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216514

Paul Nederveen

Teacher Job Satisfaction and Modern Language Curricular Variables in Alberta

Publication B-112

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ICRB
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL012 867

1982
Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme
International Center for Research on Bilingualism
Québec

Le Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme est un organisme de recherche universitaire qui reçoit une subvention de soutien du Ministère de l'Education du Québec et une contribution du Secrétariat d'Etat du Canada pour son programme de publication.

The International Center for Research on Bilingualism is a university research institution which receives a supporting grant from the Department of Education of Quebec and a contribution fror the Secretary of State of Canada for its publication programme.

© 1982 CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME
Tous droits réservés. *Imprimé au Canada*
Dépôt légal (Québec) 1er trimestre 1982
ISBN 2-89219-114-9

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the modern language teacher and various curricular influences. The effect of these influences was specifically examined in relation to the teacher's level of job satisfaction.

The problem was postulated in three questions:

1. What is the overall degree of job satisfaction of Alberta's modern language teachers?

2. What do modern language teachers perceive to be the curricular influences which concern the approach that will be used in the classroom?

3. What correlations, if any, exist between the perception of curricular influences and the overall job satisfaction for modern language teachers?

A review of the literature explored research on job satisfaction generally, teacher job satisfaction specifically, and studies concerning teacher attitude and the personal and situational factors acting as curricular influences.

Regarding methodology, a three-part, thirteen page questionnaire was constructed. The first part comprised 20 items eliciting personal and demographic information. The second elicited reaction, on a five-point scale, to sixty-five curricular influence items. The third comprised the eighteen-item Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index, an overall self-rating item, and a behavioral item to measure job satisfaction.

The questionnaire was administered to 763 Alberta modern language teachers. After one month, 422 returns had been received of which 365 were usable.

Initial analysis provided a description of the sample, measures of job satisfaction, and rating for each of the curricular influence items by their means. Specifically the Brayfield-Rothe Index revealed a mean score of 67.48 out of 90, a range of 30-89, and a standard deviation of 9.65. The self-rating item revealed that 27.1 percent were very satisfied, 56.4 percent satisfied, 7.1 percent undecided, 8.8 percent dissatisfied, and 0.3 percent very dissatisfied. These two measures showed a high correlation of 0.785 as did the third measure with a coefficient of correlation of 0.685 with the Brayfield-Rothe scores.

The curricular influence items showed a range of means of 4.164 - 1.852. The fifteen highest items revealed agreement concerning the areas of freedom, positive views of the teacher's own abilities and resources, and a desire for upgrading. The fifteen lowest items revealed disagreement concerning the

adequacy of preparation time, inservice programs, and contact with professional colleagues; the acceptability of class size, student ability ranges, amount of clerical work, and the role of politics; and concern with external examinations, community values, and the possibility of achieving fluency. Most of these items received elaboration in additional comments made by 77 respondents.

Further analysis disclosed four correlations between job satisfaction and personal factors: female teachers were generally more satisfied than male teachers, non-foreign language specialists were more satisfied than foreign language specialists, and significant positive linear relationships existed between job satisfaction and age, and between job satisfaction and total years of teaching.

Coefficients of correlation between the 65 curricular influence items and the Brayfield-Rothe scores revealed 40 items (61.5 percent) concerning supervisors, freedom, situational matters, and personal factors, with significant albeit low correlations with job satisfaction.

Factor analysis of the curricular influences disclosed eighteen factors of which 13 could be labelled. These included autonomy, teacher resources, programming, perception of foreign language acceptance, task, program resources, working conditions, student considerations, curriculum decision-making participation, upgrading, personal autonomy, classroom factors, and acceptance of the *status quo*.

In conclusion the responding modern language teachers showed a high level of job satisfaction and their overall response indicated concern with specific curricular influences, significantly related to job satisfaction for three-fifths of the items, and identifiable by factor analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY..... i

LIST OF TABLES..... v

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION..... 1

A. The Context..... 1
B. The Problem..... 2
C. Definition of Terms..... 2
D. Significance of the Study..... 3
E. Limitations and Delimitations..... 6

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH..... 14

A. General Job Satisfaction..... 14
B. Teacher Job Satisfaction..... 18
General Studies..... 18
Special Aspects..... 21
Participative Decision-Making Studies..... 23
C. General Studies of Teacher Attitude to Curriculum..... 24
D. Curricular Influences..... 27
Situational Factors..... 28
Personal Factors..... 33

CHAPTER III.

METHODOLOGY..... 50

A. Instruments..... 50
B. Population..... 52
C. Administration of the Questionnaire..... 53
D. Statistical Treatment of Data..... 54

CHAPTER IV.

ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 57

A. Characteristics of Respondents..... 57
B. Measures of Job Satisfaction..... 64
C. Description of Curricular Influences..... 67
D. Description of Comments..... 71
E. Analysis for Variance and Co-Variance for Personal and Demographic Variables for Job Satisfaction..... 72
F. Correlations Between Job Satisfaction and Curricular Influence Items..... 78
G. Factor Analysis of Curricular Influence Variables..... 81

CHAPTER V.

DISCUSSION OF THE ANALYSIS..... 92

A. Characteristics of Respondents..... 92
B. Measure of Job Satisfaction..... 92
C. Curricular Influences..... 93
D. Comments..... 94
E. Personal-Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction..... 94
F. Curricular Influences and Job Satisfaction..... 96
G. Factors of Curricular Influences..... 96

CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 100

A. Methodology..... 100
B. Findings..... 100
C. Conclusions and Interpretations..... 103
D. Recommendations..... 104

APPENDIX A

Pilot Questionnaire..... 105

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter..... 119

APPENDIX C

Final Questionnaire..... 121

APPENDIX D

Coding and Weighting Key..... 135

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 139

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I:

Distribution and Returns of Questionnaire..... 55

TABLE II:

Response Frequencies for Personal and Demographic Variables..... 58

TABLE III:

Response Frequencies of Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index Values..... 65

TABLE IV:

Response Frequencies of Other Job Satisfaction Measures..... 66

TABLE V:

Means for Fifteen Items Having the Highest Mean Agreement Scores and Rank Order Satisfaction Scores..... 69

TABLE VI:

Means for Fifteen Items Having the Lowest Mean Agreement Scores and Rank Order Dissatisfaction Scores..... 70

TABLE VII:

Curricular Influences Showing Significant Correlation ($\alpha = 0.01$) With the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Score..... 79

TABLE VIII:

Sorted Factors, Components, and Loadings..... 82

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Context

The process of education appears to involve five large components[1]: 1) the student, 2) the teacher, 3) the content matter[2], 4) the method of instruction, and 5) the environment. All of these five elements have been examined and analyzed in numerous studies devoted to providing a better understanding of, or improvements in the process of education. Many inter-relationships between these elements have also been studied but one area which has been neglected is that of the relationship between the teacher and the factors determining the chosen method of instruction.

One of the reasons[3] for the neglect of research in this field is that the student has been taken as the focal point of the educational process[4]. This bias is evidenced by the large body of research examining the student's reaction to given teacher characteristics, the student's reaction to given programs and methods, and the student's reaction to given classroom and organizational features. However, it is self-evident that the student and the teacher are partners in the learning situation, and a neglect of the teacher must be detrimental to the entire process of education[5]. Therefore, in order to provide a balancing focus, this study will concentrate on providing a fuller understanding of the teacher as an element of the educational process.

The further focus on the teacher's relationship to the factors influencing the use of a given method of instruction is two-fold. First, the type of change which is most commonly carried out in schools involves innovations in the programs and the methods of teaching which are employed, again for reasons such as the concrete nature of the intervention and the possibility of monitoring product outcomes. Thus, whereas the content matter, the setting, and the people involved change only gradually or remain relatively stable, the program and method of instruction are capable of being modified with comparative ease. Second, studies of teacher attitudes, like those of Remple and Bentley[6], Francoeur[7], and Young[8], have found that teachers are dissatisfied with factors related to curriculum and instruction and are desirous of participating to improve them. In consideration, then, of the on-going changes in this area and the concern which research reveals among teachers for it, an examination of this specific facet of the teacher role is both practical and pertinent.

Within this general context therefore, this study proposes to explore and to analyze some of the factors involved in the relationship between the modern language teacher and the elements influencing the use of a method of instruction. It has been noted that these are important as major components of the educational process. Furthermore, it has been noted that teachers themselves are dissatisfied with this aspect of education. Finally, many authorities concur that it is the teacher working with a given method that is essential to successful learning outcomes, but whose relationship is not sufficiently understood. Burstall[9], for example, maintains that "the curriculum must provide the framework for the pupil's experience of learning, but

the way in which this experience is structured...will depend crucially...on his teacher", while Cay[10] claims that "the teacher, now as always, is the focal point of any curriculum...The success or failure of most teaching-learning situations has always been largely dependent upon...the teacher".

B. The Problem

Both the teacher and the factors related to the use of a given method of instruction are very complex elements which comprise too many components to allow a full exploration of their relationship in a single study. This study will be limited to examining the job satisfaction of Modern Language teachers and their perception of curricular influences in their work. The main thrust of the study will be directed to answering three questions:

1) What is the degree of overall job satisfaction of Modern Language teachers in Alberta?

2) What do Modern Language teachers perceive to be the curricular influences which determine the approach that will be used in the classroom?

3) What correlations, if any, exist between the perception of curricular influences and the overall job satisfaction for Modern Language teachers?

These questions reveal three major limitations on the chosen field of study. The first is that job satisfaction has been isolated as the factor representative of the teacher. The reasons for selecting job satisfaction are many, but basically it is recognized as a single variable which nonetheless encompasses many other factors[11]. Furthermore, this comprehensive dimension is relatively easy to measure[12] and it is accepted as an important component of the work situation[13].

The second limitation is reflected in the use of the term "curricular influences". This expression is intended to distinguish an area within the domain of the teacher, as opposed to the objectives and goals set by the province[14] or the actual implementational strategies used within the classroom.

The third limitation is the focus on the perceptions of curricular influences held by Modern Language teachers. This restriction is motivated by the recognition that a teacher's response to the prescribed provincial program is not passive, but evaluated, together with other factors, in light of an appraisal of their importance[15]. The teacher's actual perception of various curriculum-related factors is intimately tied to the teacher's values and beliefs.

C. Definition of Terms

Since this study deals with several concepts that have popular connota-

tions as well as varied specific uses, it is necessary to consider their meanings in the context of this investigation.

Job Satisfaction: Wanous and Lawler[16] cite nine different operational definitions of job satisfaction, all of which measure the sum of the satisfaction with various facets of the work.

The term as used here, however, designates the general degree of overall contentment of the individual with his work situation[17], specifically as measured by responses to the Brayfield-Rothe "Index of Job Satisfaction"[18] and two additional questions, one global which asks for a self-rating of one's level of job satisfaction, and one behavioral which asks which conditions would induce one to change employment. The Brayfield-Rothe scale emphasizes the global, affective aspect of the concept with the advantages: a) that it eliminates the need to weight the component facets and their interplay in a specific situation[19], b) that it eliminates the presupposed causality implicit in many of the scales where the facets of the work determine the general job satisfaction, and c) that it is an easily administered, short, straight-forward tool which has been frequently used[20] and is accepted, even by proponents of multi-faceted scales[21].

The decision to include the two additional questions stems from the use of such measures by other researchers such as Holdaway[22] who used a single self-rating global item, or Belasco and Alutto[23] who used behavioral measures, and from the desirability of being able to compare findings between these and the present study.

Curricular Influences: This term will be used to refer to those factors which affect the teacher's decisions in the formation of a program for instruction. These factors, gleaned from a review of the literature, include situational and organizational variables, political variables, resource variables, student variables, and personal teacher variables.

Modern Language Teachers: Those teachers who taught French, German, or Ukrainian as a second language for one-third or more of the school day were considered modern language teachers. While 35 schools (35/1418) use French as the language of instruction and some of them teach English as a second language, those English teachers were not included. Also not included were teachers of various immersion courses.

Curriculum: For the purposes of this study curriculum will refer to the educational design of learning experiences specifically within the control of the school[24].

D. Significance of the Study

The basic reason for this study is its intention to provide a better understanding of the teacher as a component in the educational process. Burstall[25] points out that:

> *The curriculum must provide the framework for the pupil's experience of learning, but the way in*

> *which this experience is structured and presented to him will depend crucially on the attitudes and expectations of his teacher. No matter how comprehensive and appropriate the content of a given curriculum, it can only be presented to the pupil through the actions of his teacher: it is the teacher whose behavior will structure the learning situation for the pupil and whose expectations will set the seal on the pupil's own level of aspiration and his subsequent achievement.* p. 48.

Newton and Housego[26] concur, claiming that "the key people in the implementation of most changes are the teachers..." Gardner[27] further argues that "if a teacher cannot successfully manage learning situations for his pupils, he need not exist" and deducts that the teacher's behavior is of extreme importance in creating a successful learning situation. Gardner considers the teacher's needs as an implicit factor in determining his behavior. Other writers and certain psychologists like Papalia[28] would include the teacher's attitudes, beliefs and values, and external pressures and influences as other implicit determinants of behavior.

The repercussions of a teacher's attitudes and actions are many and studies have pointed out many important effects. Benefits accruing to the student may include improved achievement[29], higher expectations and motivation[30], and better attitudes and conduct[31]. While the relationship between such results and the teacher factor are not uncontested[32], the positive findings and the possibility that they may be confirmed suggest that further study of teacher attitudes and actions is worthy of consideration. Although this study will not be aimed in this direction, it is important to note, as Francoeur[33] does, that many actions, whether by or concerning teachers, are taken with an implicit expectation of such student outcomes. A better understanding of the independent variable, the teacher, is likely to enable a clearer evaluation of any such relationship as might exist.

The second effect of teacher attitudes and action which make them worthy of study concerns the actual functioning of the school. Results like those of Simms[34], Herron[35], Symington and Fensham[36], and Newton[37] have isolated the teacher's attitude to a given curricular innovation as a key factor in determining the successful implementation of the innovation. Blanton and Uffelman conclude that a teacher's "positive perceptions...of innovative concepts are directly related to (the) present implementation of such concepts"[38]. Other studies, such as those of Chase[39], Campbell[40] and Anderson[41], have linked teacher job satisfaction to harmonious relations among the staff, and general high morale within the school. The associated advantages of mutual support and cooperation appear not only among colleagues but also between administrators and teachers. Another aspect of special concern to administrators is related to the connection between job satisfaction and staff absenteeism and turnover. Initial research conducted by industry showed a link between these variables[42] and subsequent confirmation exists for more general populations, such as the ten-year Andrisani study[43], and for specific teacher populations, such as the Butler study[44]. The costs to the system are not only those of recruitment and training, but also those resulting from the disruption of communication and support mechanisms which exist in

schools as mentioned by Keith[45]. A final organizational effect of teacher attitudes is to be found in research on teacher militancy. While the mechanisms are not entirely clear, the findings of Corwin[46], Hennessey[47], Defasio[48], and Giandomenico[49] support the hypothesis that dissatisfaction stemming from job-related need deficiencies will lead to militancy. The costs ensuing from militancy are well documented in the literature on work disruptions. Thus, in the four areas of curriculum implementation, staff harmony, staff retention, and teacher militancy, research results exist and point to the importance of teacher attitudes and specifically job satisfaction with the overall effective operation of the school[50].

The third and final effect of the teacher's attitudes concerns the teacher himself. De Garcia and Reynolds[51] argue that:

> *if the teacher is to assist the student in some systematic way to discover who he is and what he believes in, the teacher must be given the opportunity to discover where he or she stands, personally and professionally. It is illogical to assume that one can choose meaningfully between alternatives in the process of personal and professional growth, if the opportunity for contemplation of whether actions match stated beliefs is not given. Knowing where we are is a requisite to deciding where we want to go. One only has to recognize the ambivalent responses of teachers when presented with alternative modes of action to realize that values classification has been a neglected dimension of professional development.* p. 650.

The concept that the teacher's own well-being is of importance can be documented in studies relating job attitudes to mental health. The results of Kornhauser[52], Iris and Barrett[53], and Meyers, Freidman and Gangham[54], all confirm such a relationship. Other specific benefits to the teacher resulting from positive attitudes and satisfaction may include less stressful behavior. Brophy and Good[55], for example, suggest that ego-defensiveness will prevent the teacher from paying proper attention to individual student differences. Other studies claim that teachers under stress are not as flexible nor as enthusiastic as those not under stress[56]. While the implications of these findings can be, and have been, explored to show monetary or product outcome advantages, the humanitarian value of improved teacher job satisfaction as a goal in itself is important.

In general, then, the value of this study centers on the importance of teacher attitudes. Areas which are affected by them include student achievement and attitude outcomes, various aspects of organizational efficiency, and features of teacher well-being. Despite these indications, however, numerous authors[57] report that, in fact, there is little consideration given to the teacher's attitudes and needs when curriculum changes are adopted by administrators. Furthermore, Pylypiw[58], Tom[59], and Gunter[60] report that current models for the implementation of externally developed curricula do not correspond to reality, with the underrated factor being "the teacher's

personal background and value "system"[61]. In some cases it was found that teachers were insufficiently knowledgeable to make sound curricular decisions. In other cases it was found that analytical teachers still resorted to making decisions on the basis of emotional, political, or other considerations. Thus, these studies underscore the incomplete state of present knowledge concerning curricular variables. McKeatchie[62] suggests that while the actual variables have largely been identified their interactions need to be explored. His findings showed that the interactions effect of certain factors were stronger than the factors taken separately. The specific interaction of curricular influences on teacher satisfaction would be of value in furthering understanding of curriculum work.

Thus, a wide variety of research studies point to the need for a closer examination of these areas. Curriculum variables somehow influence the teacher's decisions, and teacher attributes are reflected in the final program to be implemented. It is this interplay which is examined in this study. It is in clarifying the relationship between these variables that this study has significance.

E. Limitations and Delimitations

A number of constraints, both beyond and within the control of the researcher, exist in this study. Whereas these limitations are present in the methodology and affect the outcomes of their interpretation, they are presented here.

First, the study is limited to modern language teachers as defined in the province of Alberta during the school term of 1978-1980. The sample consisted of 763 teachers. That this particular year witnessed the dissemination of new "Curriculum Handbooks"[63] may have heightened teacher feelings relating to curricular influences. However, since it is precisely the initial impact of such factors which is of concern, this condition is not considered to be so exceptional as to weaken the findings.

Second, the focus on specific factors concerning the teacher and the curriculum is a limitation. It is recognized that other factors do exist and this study examines only those that were included in its questionnaires[64].

Third, this study is limited by the existence of a 55.3 percent response rate. The possibility exists that nonresponding teachers may derive from a specific group such as those who are either very dissatisfied or very satisfied with their jobs, or those who have very little or very high interest in curriculum matters. The attempt to correlate this study with the findings of other studies may offset this possibility, but no assurance can be given that this is indeed the case.

Fourth, a limitation exists in the choice of an attitude questionnaire as the measuring tool for the two variables. The central problem stemming from the disparity between what people say is the case and what is actually the case is a serious one. Bohrnstedt[65] has conducted a study which found the questionnaire equal in reliability to the interview in eliciting job

attitudes. Still the necessity of inferring the accuracy of results exists since no actual manipulations or observations were undertaken. Steps were taken to ensure the anonymity of the respondents encouraging them to feel free to express their true views.

Fifth, since the primary nature of this study is descriptive, the analysis of the results can be no more than correlational. Although the terms "independent" and "dependent" variables are used to show relationships, no claims are made as to cause and effect between them.

Finally, each decision made in the course of the research imposes limitations on the study. While it is impractical to specify all of these, efforts are taken to follow the rule of disclosure[66], explicitly stating decisions and reasons, in order to allow for a continuous evaluation on the validity of this study.

NOTES

1. D.G. Ryans, "Teacher Behavior Theory and Research: Implications for Teacher Education", in: *Teaching: Vantage Points for Study*, R.T. Hyman (ed.), Philadelphia, J.B. Lippencott, 1968, pp. 40-41. A model of five similar large components is presented.

2. The content matter is taken to refer to the information which is to be transmitted or the skills which are to be developed.

3. Other reasons could be such factors as teacher sensitivity to evaluation or the emphasis on measuring product outcomes.

4. R. de Garcia; S. Reynolds, "Foreign Language Teachers Attitudes: A Strategy for Exploration and Change", *Foreign Language Annals*, Volume 10, Number 6, December 1977.

   S.Y. Savignon, "On the Other Side of the Desk: A Look at Teacher Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning", *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Volume 32, Number 3, February 1976.

5. M. Langenbach, *Development of an Instrument to Measure Teachers Attitudes Toward Curriculum Use and Planning*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1969.

   > *The primary preoccupation of educators has been planning for observing changes in pupils' behaviors and attitudes. Not without importance, however, are the considerations regarding teachers' behaviors and attitudes: what they are and how they can change.* p. 1.

6. A. Remple; R.R. Bentley, "Teacher Morale: Relationship with Selected Factors", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter 1970.

7. K. Francoeur, *Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

8. J.H. Young, *The Curriculum Decision-Making Preferences of Alberta School Personnel*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1977.

9. C. Burstall, "French in the Primary School: Some Early Findings", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Volume 2, Number 1, May 1970. p. 48.

10. D.F. Cay, *Curriculum: Design for Learning*, New York, Bobbs Merrill Company, 1966. p. 56.

11. E.A. Locke, "What is Job Satisfaction?" *Organizational Behavior and Performance*, Volume 4, Number 4, November 1969.

E.A. Holdaway, *Teacher Satisfaction: an Alberta Report*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1978, p. 6.

12. A.H. Brayfield, H.F. Rothe, "An Instrument of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 35, Number 5, October 1951. p. 307.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

14. The formal goals and objectives, often referred to as *the curriculum* are detailed in the Course of Studies for each subject area.

15. Locke, *Op. Cit.*, 1969. The model of satisfaction suggested involves personal standards and a judgment of the job aspects in light of them.

V.H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, New York, Wiley, 1964. Even in attributing satisfaction and dissatisfaction the responses may be characterized by individual biases. Cf. p. 129.

16. J.P. Wanous; E.E. Lawler, "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 56, Number 2, April 1972.

17. Locke, *Op. Cit.*, 1969. Job satisfaction is the emotional state resulting from the relation of what a job offers to what is wanted from the job.

18. Brayfield; Rothe, *Op. Cit.*, 1951.

19. For example, Conroy (1979) and Knoop and O'Reilly (1976) found that the facet tool of Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), the Job Descriptive Index, was not readily applicable to teachers.

20. See in bibliography: Barrett (1969); Passalacqua (1970); Wickstrom (1973); Yuskiewicz, Willower (1973); Allen, Hamelin, Nixon (1976).

21. P.C. Smith; L.M. Kendall; C.L. Hulin, *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1969. "The desirability of the separation of scales does not mean that carefully constructed global summary measures by the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index are not also potentially useful... p. 152.

22. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

23. J.A. Belasco; J.A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 8, Number 1, Winter 1972.

24. J.G. Saylor; W.M. Alexander, *Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1954, "Curriculum encompasses all learning opportunities provided by the school". p. 5.

G.A. Beauchamp, *Planning the Elementary School Curriculum*, Boston, Allyn-Bacon, 1956, "Curriculum is the design of a social group for the educational experiences of their children in school". p. 1.

25. Burstall, *Op. Cit.*, 1970.

26. E.E. Newton; I.E. Housego, "Teacher Reaction to Change: A Case Study", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 6, Number 7, April 1967, p. 25.

27. R.M. Gardner, *Curriculum Planning Needs of Teachers*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971. p. 2.

28. A. Papalia, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Current Trends in Foreign Language Instruction", *Canadian Modern Language*, Volume 33, Number 3, January 1977.

29. B. Rosenshine, *Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement*, Slough, NFER, 1971.

30. D. Pidgeon, *Expectation and Pupil Performance*, Stockholm, Almquist, 1970.

R. Rosenthal; L. Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupil's Intellectual Development*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

31. S. Mallula, *Teacher Competency, Teacher Attitude and Student Attitude Toward Reading*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

32. J.D. Elashoff; R.D. Snow, *Pygmalion Reconsidered*, Worthington, Ohio, C.A. Jones, 1971.

George K. McGuire, *The Effect on Student Achievement of Teacher Participation in Curriculum Planning*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 1959.

33. Francoeur, *Op. Cit.*, 1963.

34. J.J. Simms, *The Dynamics of Implementation of Curriculum Innovations*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

35. M. Herron, "On Teacher Perception and Curricular Innovation", *Curriculum Theory Network*, Number 7, 1971.

36. D.J. Symington; P.J. Fensham, "Elementary School Teachers' Closed-Mindedness, Attitudes Toward Science, and Congruence with a New Curriculum", *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Volume 13, Number 5, September 1976.

37. E.E. Newton, *Teacher Reaction to Change*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 1967.

38. M.E. Blanton; G.W. Uffelman, *High School Teacher Perceptions of Innovative Concepts*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Southern California, 1978.

39. F. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Volume 33, Number 3, November 1951.

40. M.V. Campbell, "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role", *Administrator's Notebook*, Volume 7, Number 6, February 1959.

41. L.W. Anderson, "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement", *Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 46, Number 9, May 1953.

42. T.C. Ross, A. Zander, "Needs, Satisfactions and Employee Turnover", in: *Management and Motivation*, Vroom; Deci (eds.), Kingsport, Tennessee, Penguin, 1970.

43. P.J. Andrisani, *Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience*, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.

44. T.M. Butler, "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers", *Clearing House*, Volume 36, Number 1, September 1961.

45. P.M. Keith, "Administrative and Faculty Turnover and Diffusion of an Educational Innovation", *Urban Education*, Volume 10, Number 3, October 1975.

46. R.G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education", *Sociology of Education*, Volume 38, Number 4, Summer 1965.

47. P.H. Hennessey, *Teacher Militancy: A Comparative Study of Ontario, Quebec, and New York Teachers, 1975* (monograph), Ottawa, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1975.

48. R.J. Defasio, *A Study of the Relationship Among Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Militancy and School District Conflict*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Syracuse University, 1978.

49. L.L. Giandomenico, "Teacher Needs, Militancy and the Scope of Collective Bargaining", *Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 66, Number 6, February 1973.

50. R. Knoop, R. O'Reilly, *Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organizational Effectiveness of Elementary Schools*, paper to Canadian Association for Study of Educational Administration, Laval University, Quebec City, June 3, 1976.

51. de Garcia; Reynolds, *Op. Cit.*, 1977.

52. A. Kronhauser, "Job Satisfaction in Relation to Mental Health", in: Vroom, Deci (eds.), *Op. Cit.*, 1970.

53. B. Iris; G. Barrett, "Some Relations Between Job and Life Satisfaction and Job Importance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 56, Number 4, 1972.

54. J. Meyers; M.P. Freidman; E.J. Gangham, "The Effects of Consultee-Centered Consultation on Teacher Behavior", *Psychology in the Schools*, Volume 12, Number 3, July 1975.

55. J.E. Brophy; T.L. Good, *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974. p. 295.

56. Rosenshine, *Op. Cit.*, 1971, Chapters 4,5.

57. For example: K.D. Benne; B. Muntyan, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change*, New York, Dryden Press, 1951.

    C. Clark; R.J. Yinger, "Research on Teacher Thinking", *Curriculum Inquiry*, Volume 7, Number 4, Winter 1977.

58. J.A. Pylypiw, *A Description of Classroom Curriculum Development*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1974.

59. A. Tom, "Teacher Reaction to a Systematic Approach to Curriculum Implementation", *Curriculum Theory Network*, Number 11, Spring 1973.

60. M.A. Gunter, *The process of Curriculum Decision-Making in the Intermediate Schools of Charlottesville, Virginia 1963-1970*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1978.

61. Pylypiw, *Op. Cit.*, 1974, p. 146.

    C. Beecher, "Curriculum Practices: Their Effect and/or Relationship to Selected Biographical and Professional Variables", *Journal of Experimental Education*, Volume 46, Number 2, Winter 1978.

62. W.J. McKeatchie, "Motivation, Teaching Methods and College Learning", *paper in Current Theory and Research on Motivation Volume IX Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Marshall Jones (ed.), Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

    Also an ERIC computer search showed:

    25,211 documents concerning curriculum
     7,388 documents concerning teacher attitudes
       548 intersection between *curriculum* and *teacher attitudes*
     2,032 job satisfaction/teacher morale
         6 intersection between *job satisfaction/teacher morale* and first intersection

    Thus, very little research exists on the interaction effects of attitude and curriculum.

63. For French, the first three years of the six-year program and the nine-year program were published and distributed.

64. Temptation exists to infer a relation of these factors to an application of them. Such extensions are not intended.

65. G.W. Bohrnstedt, "A Methodological Note Comparing the Questionnaire and the Interview", *Journal of Psychological Studies*, Volume 15, Number 1, March 1967.

66. Young, *Op. Cit.*, 1977, p. 10.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

There is a vast amount of literature which deals separately with the topics of teachers, job satisfaction, and curricula. The intention in this chapter will be to review some of the more pertinent writings which relate to this study. To permit a systematic examination of the literature, the areas of general job satisfaction, teacher job satisfaction, teacher attitudes to curricula, and curricular influences will be used to guide the review.

A. General Job Satisfaction

Wanous and Lawler in their article "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction"[1] point out that a number of different conceptual definitions of job satisfaction exist. Frequent reference will be made to their formulations of these definitions which are concise and show a consistency of terminology.

Current interest in job satisfaction dates back to the studies of Mayo[2] at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in the 1920's. The main concern of these experiments was initially the reduction of labor turnover and subsequently the increasing of productivity. It was found that the manipulation of such job variables as rest periods, snack periods, mode of payment, illumination, hours of work, and length of work-week could result in a "simultaneous improvement in attitude and effectiveness (and, in turn) indicated that there might be a definite relationship between them"[3]. Thus, one of the initial studies to concern itself with worker morale examined the individual and combined impact of the facets of the job. The first formulation examined by Wanous and Lawler is the concept of job satisfaction as the simple summation of satisfaction with the component facets of the job:

$$J.S. = \sum_{\text{facets}} (J.F.S.)^{4}.$$

A sophisticated model of this can be seen in the "Job Descriptive Index" (J.D.I.) of Smith, Kendall and Hulin[5] who isolated the five facets work, supervision, pay, promotion, and co-workers to reflect the overall satisfaction. Smith, Kendall and Hulin[6] view job satisfaction as a function of the perceived characteristics of the job in relation to an individual's frame of reference as provided by interrelationships of expectations, prior experience, actual experience, and alternatives. In the actual instrument, however, these factors are not isolated and the checklist format records simple scores for the various aspects, the total of which provides the overall job satisfaction score.

A second construct involving a simple summation of facets was employed by Alderfer[7]. The units of measurement were the amount of goal attainment or the fulfillment of needs for various aspects of the job as rated on a 6-point scale. Wanous and Lawler formulate this as the summation of "How much there is now" for the particular job facets:

$$J.S. = \sum_{\text{facets}} (\text{Is Now}).$$

Consideration of the various facets of a job poses two problems which are answered by alternate conceptions of job satisfaction. First is the problem of the endless number of facets which affects attitudes to work and the variance in facets for different jobs[8]. Brayfield and Rothe[9] included as the first two requirements for their instrument that "1. It should give an index to 'overall' job satisfaction rather than to specific aspects of the job situation. 2. It should be applicable to a wide variety of jobs"[10]. The result of these requirements was a single global measurement in which items referring to specific aspects of the job were eliminated and only *overall* attitudinal factors were used. The global measure of the General Motors Faces scale developed by Kunin[11] reflects the same conception and it is noteworthy that the validity of the facets of the summary scales have often been judged against these two scales.

The second problem of summing facet reactions to achieve a total satisfaction score is that a distinction is not made between the importance of the various facets for different individuals. To test the necessity of considering an individual's value hierarchy, Locke[12] compared the satisfaction ratings of subjects performing the same task under different conditions of importance. The results showed that "success caused more satisfaction and failure caused more dissatisfaction on the trials considered more important"[13]. Wanous and Lawler point out that the corresponding formulations which take into account the values of the facets to the individual would be

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\text{facets}} (\text{Importance} \times \text{J.F.S.})$$

and

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\text{facets}} (\text{Importance} \times \text{Is Now}).$$

As an example of the former they propose Schaffer[14] who selected 12 facets, measured the strength of each and their degree of fulfillment, and combined these to increase the prediction of overall job satisfaction. As an example of the latter they propose Vroom[15] whose model takes into account the "valence for a job outcome", corresponding to the importance, as well as the "instrumentality of holding a job for receiving ar outcome", corresponding to the goal attainment or "is now". The interest in the weighting of the facets of job satisfaction, however, also produced some negative findings. Ewen[16] in 1967 and Mikes and Hulin[17] in 1968, concur in their conclusions that "it appears that the use of importance measures as multiplicative weights in a model of job satisfaction does not in fact yield the relationships between a composite measure of job satisfaction and behavior or between a composite measure of behavior and overall satisfaction which are stronger, more consistent, or more theoretically appealing"[18]. Addressing these conflicting findings, Mobley and Locke[19] note that some measures of satisfaction, especially scale measures, already reflect the importance attributed to factors by individuals. Their findings show that "importance of a value to an individual does influence the range of affect which that value can produce" but "if importance is already reflected in the satisfaction ratings, there is nothing to be gained by including it again"[20].

The summary models presented thus far have viewed the facet reactions, whether weighted or unweighted, as unique measures. A number of authors have

postulated the facet reaction as the discrepancy between an individual's perception of some aspect of the job and some implicit or explicit standard[21] held by that individual. Schaffer[22], while using a unique measure, suggested that satisfaction would "vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied". Porter[23] operationalized this concept by asking respondents to evaluate their perceived needs (how much should there be?) and their perception of needs fulfillment (how much is there?) and calculating the difference. Wanous and Lawler formulate this theory of needs discrepancy as:

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\xi}^{\text{facets}} \text{(Should Be - Is Now)}.$$

The need questionnaire developed by Porter included a third question asking for a rating of the importance of the need. The value response was not included in the calculation of the need discrepancy but was intended to allow a comparison of the levels of need for the two groups of respondents. The levels considered were those elaborated by Maslow in his theory of human motivation. Maslow's[24] theory, however, emphasizes again the necessity of considering the importance of the various facets. Maslow basically postulated five areas of basic needs: physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization, related in a hierarchy of prepotency. Maslow claims that in normal circumstances the more fundamental needs will monopolize the attention and activity of the individual and only when these have been met will the higher needs motivate his action. This theory together with Porter's[25] subsequent analysis of the variation in the perceived importance of needs would suggest a valanced model of need discrepancy[26]. Wanous and Lawler formulate such a construct as:

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\xi}^{\text{facet}} [\text{Importance x (Should Be - Is Now)}]$$

Another view of categories of needs was taken by Herzberg[27]. Using a critical incident technique to determine satisfaction factors, Herzberg observed that different sets of factors correlated with reports of satisfaction and reports of dissatisfaction. Whereas those factors tending to be associated with dissatisfaction related to the context of the job, those associated with satisfaction related to the content of the job. Herzberg further concluded that while the former, labelled "hygienes", had the capacity to dissatisfy but not to satisfy, and the latter, labelled "motivators", had the capacity to satisfy but not to dissatisfy, therefore satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two distinct entities, disparate of each other.

Porter, Lawler, and Hackman[28] included aspects of both Maslow and Herzberg in their suggestion of a two-step hierarchy. Grouping physiological and safety needs into a low-level category they suggest that these are satisfied by extrinsic outcomes, those external to the person and having a concrete reality; while the higher level needs are satisfied by intrinsic outcomes, those internal to the person and given by the person to himself.

The Herzberg Motivator-Hygiene theory of job satisfaction was a much contested construct which elicited many alternative explanations for the same findings. Vroom[29] postulated that the results might be an effect of

a defense mechanism whereby an individual attributes dissatisfaction to external factors but credits himself for his satisfaction. Hazer[30] proposed that since the critical incident technique elicits extreme situations, it was still possible that a single continuum of satisfaction exists with the effects of separate factors appearing primarily at one extreme and showing a negligible effect at the other. Wernimont[31] suggested basically that Herzberg's motivators or intrinsic factors must have exterior sources which were the extrinsic factors. His model postulated that the extrinsic factors produced the intrinsic factors which manifested themselves in the measurable aspects of satisfaction. In addition to such alternate explanations, Herzberg's theory was tested with other instruments and other populations by other researchers. Sergiovani[32] and Wickstrom[33] both used Herzberg's critical incident reporting technique to examine the disparateness of satisfiers and dissatisfiers among teachers. Sergiovani concluded with general support for Herzberg's two factor theory but cautioned that dissatisfiers would temper the effect of satisfiers. Only limited support for Herzberg's theory, however, was shown by Wickstrom's results. Herzberg's factors were found to provide an adequate listing of satisfiers and dissatisfiers, but all of the factors exhibited a bi-polar nature and appeared in ten percent or more of both satisfying and dissatisfying incidents. Schmidt's[34] study of school administrators, however, did find satisfiers and dissatisfiers to be unique and disparate factors as claimed by Herzberg. Using video-tape replays and interaction analysis, Passalacqua[35] provided teachers with a feedback on their classroom behavior, and thereby attempted a behavioral test of Herzberg's theory. Assuming that such feedback related to job content, which Herzberg had classified as a motivator or satisfier, Passalacqua then measured changes in job satisfaction. The results showed that the use of feedback did not significantly improve job satisfaction. But again, by way of contrast, Andrisani's[36] ten-year longitudinal study of some 5,000 workers seemed to show a consistent relationship between intrinsic factors as satisfiers and extrinsic factors as dissatisfiers. Thus, despite the number of studies conducted, a consistent set of results has not emerged to support Herzberg's theory.

While the above models have basically been concerned with needs and the amount of perceived need fulfillment, other types of discrepancy have been used as a basis for determining job satisfaction. Rather than measuring the differences between what an individual is receiving and should be receiving, Lofquist and Dawis[37] based their Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire on the differences between what an individual is receiving and would like to be receiving. Locke[38] points out that the former need-models are measures of the degree of equitable outcome present in a job while the latter, a "want" model, is a measure of the degree of ideal outcome. Wanous and Lawler formulate this concept as:

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\text{facet}} \xi \text{ (Would Like - Is Now)}$$

and the corresponding weighted version as:

$$\text{J.S.} = \sum_{\text{facet}} \xi \text{ [Importance x (Would Like - Is Now)]}$$

Vroom[39] provides a further possibility when he suggests that individuals judge the degree of motive satisfaction according to their perceptions of what others are receiving. Vroom does not imply that community standards are the sole base for determining descrepancy but that they are very relevant. Vroom also mentions the complex phenomena of expectation as a relevant standard against which individuals judge what they receive from their jobs. Another factor, raised by Iris and Barrett[40] and Misket, Glasnapp and Hatley[41], is that the importance of the job itself affects the amount of perceived satisfaction in the job and in the job facets.

As a final view of job satisfaction, the possibility exists of incorporating the organization's demands with those of the employee. Mumford[42] argues that "a more realistic approach to job satisfaction may be to look (not only) at the individual's needs in work, but to examine also the needs of the firm and the demands which it has to make of its employees because of pressure exerted by the environment in which it operates. This leads us to consider job satisfaction in terms of the "fit" between what an organization seeks of its employees and what the employees are seeking of the firm"[43]. Mumford goes on to specifically set out the areas of knowledge, psychological, efficiency, ethical, and task structure contracts between the organization and the worker. This model supports similar considerations set out by Leavitt[44], March and Simon[45] concerning the organization's demands which a worker agrees to meet in his employment contract.

In summary, then, the studies in general job satisfaction have shown the development of various models of job satisfaction including simple reactions to various job aspects, objective measures of those same aspects, and various discrepancy formulations. Additional models were presented by other studies which added weightings for the various aspects in each formulation. The problems which existed with the various "summed facet" models and which led to the "valenced" models have, however, not been resolved. In view of these problems, the frequent recourse to a single global measurement by many of the authors is worthy of note and this approach has been chosen for the conduct of this study.

B. Teacher Job Satisfaction

A number of studies of job satisfaction have specifically focussed on populations of teachers. To facilitate their review the arbitrary categories of general studies, special aspect studies, and participative decision-making studies will be used.

General Studies

One of the earliest researchers isolating a population of teachers was conducted by Hoppock[46] in 1935. Using a 255-item questionnaire, 500 teachers were surveyed and, on the basis of total satisfaction scores, the responses of the 100 most-satisfied and the 100 most dissatisfied were compared. Results showed that satisfaction correlated positively with being emotionally adjusted, being religious, enjoying better human relationships with superiors and associates, feeling more successful, having selected their vocation,

living in larger cities, perceiving more favorable family influences and social status, being older, and perceiving less monotony and fatigue.

In 1940 McClusky and Strayer[47] polled over 300 teachers for various sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The responses were classified and used to create their 107-item "Teacher Situations Test" with reactions to be rated on seven-point (+3 to -3) satisfaction scale for each item. Administering this test to 171 Michigan teachers, the results showed that women were more extreme in their reactions than men, that teachers tend to experience greater dissatisfaction between the fourth and twelfth years of teaching, and that the teacher-pupil relationship accounts for the "most conspicuous source of feeling in a teacher's life"[48] whether positive or negative. The final conclusion, however, was that nearly all phases of a teacher's life contribute to his adjustment.

A very extensive study of teacher satisfaction was conducted in 1951 by Chase[49] using 1,758 subjects. The questionnaire explored general satisfaction questions, a rating of actual sources of satisfaction, a rating of potential sources of satisfaction, and a free-response question on the changes desired in the teaching situation. Many analyses of the data were performed and the summary of the major factors of satisfaction included the freedom to plan one's work, an adequate salary, the quality of professional leadership and supervision, the degree of involvement in education and personnel policy planning, and the existence of working conditions which permit effective work.

With a sample of 148 beginning teachers, Aikenhead[50] conducted his 1960 study in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The results of the 33-item questionnaire showed that inadequate school facilities and the areas of teacher training and supervision were the most discouraging factors. A "free description of teaching highlights" item revealed that student discipline and critical parents were the most common discouraging elements, while a general liking for teaching and an enjoyment of students and student attitudes were the most common sources of satisfaction.

Beginning teachers were also the subject of a study done by Butler[51] in 1961. A comparison of the 38 least satisfied teachers to the 41 most satisfied teachers showed "the most significant causes of job satisfaction or lack of satisfaction on the part of beginning teachers are their feeling toward the administration of the school, their feeling of freedom in the classroom or lack of it, and whether or not they feel involved in school policy making[52]". Butler further concluded "that there is a direct relationship between job satisfaction and the retention of teachers"[53].

McLaughlin and Shea[54] had also been concerned with the problem of teacher retention and conducted a survey of causes of dissatisfaction with 793 California teachers in 1960. Using a weighted measure, the top causes of dissatisfaction proved to be excessive clerical work, inadequate salary, supervisory duties, negative student attitude toward learning, meetings, over-enrollment of classes, inadequate equipment and facilities, faculty teacher-administrator relationships, ineffective school discipline policies, and student discipline. It was noted that while elementary and secondary teachers generally have the same problems there are differences in the im-

portance of them.

In 1963 Francoeur[55] conducted a study of 472 Quebec teachers. Basing her instrument largely on Chase's model, the three parts comprised a general attitude questionnaire, a 37-item section concerning specific conditions of teaching, and a recording of suggestions for change in nine specific areas. The findings showed that the factors most likely to produce satisfaction were: helpful leadership, supervision and assistance; regular participation in policy making; freedom in the choice of teaching methods; consideration of the teacher's preference in job assignment; and generous provisions for sick leave. Factors leading to dissatisfaction were a lack of opportunity for participation in making the curriculum, the apportionment of subject matter, the policies concerning pupil progress, the unattainability of the aims and objectives of the course of studies, and the limited amount of activities of a social or cultural nature.

An Alberta study by Okonkwa[56] in 1966 was based on a sample of 359 teachers. Using a 4-point response scale, the instrument consisted of eight questions on attitudes to teaching and to the school system in general, and 49 questions concerning specific aspects of the job. It was found that the majority of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with six of the 49 items, namely: channels of communication, principals who criticize indiscriminately, supervisors and consultants, recognition of outstanding teachers, differences in the ability of pupils, and extra supervisory duties.

In 1970 Remple and Bentley[57] published the results of an eight-year study of personal and situational factors influencing morale. Their 10-factor Purdue Teacher Opinion-naire was administered to 3,075 secondary school teachers in Indiana and Oregon. Significant differences were found in that males were more sasisfied than females, the more experienced teachers (except for an initial decline) were more satisfied than the less experienced teachers, and teachers with master's degrees had higher morale than teachers with bachelor's degrees. In addition, school size correlated with more satisfaction on the salary, curriculum, and school facilities scales, and vocational and non-vocational teachers differed in satisfaction on the work load scale. The comparison of Indiana and Oregon showed similar overall morale scores, but the facets varied considerably. Remple and Bentley argue that "the results of the study clearly indicated that reliance on a total score as a measure of morale can be grossly misleading. In order to evaluate teacher morale meaningfully, comparison should be based on the components that make up morale"[58].

Lacy[59] in 1973 administered a 49-item checklist of attitudes to business education teachers. The replies of the 242 respondents showed the factors affecting overall teacher satisfaction to be the community in which the teacher lives, fringe benefits, the attitudes and actions of the school administration, salary, the attitudes and behavior of students, teaching load, departmental support in financing, teaching and business world experience, and provisions that allow teachers to meet the needs of their students. Lacy also specifically compared the satisfactions of teachers of two different business programs, but found no significant differences attributable to them.

Murnane and Phillips[60] in 1977 also employed the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire but used the replies of the 650 Math and English teachers to compare the satisfaction scores with the attributes of various schools. Their findings showed that teachers in self-contained classrooms are more satisfied than those in departmentalized programs for the factors of curriculum, principal, and materials and procedures. Teachers of high achieving students are less satisfied with curriculum and with materials and procedures. The size of the school correlated with satisfaction with the principal and with colleagues. Generally, the results confirmed the contention that the attributes of the work-place have a differential effect on various aspects of job satisfaction.

Using the 20-scale Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire with 676 business teachers in 1978, Hadaway[61] compared the satisfaction scores with selected personal characteristics of the respondents. Age showed significant differentiation on the compensation and authority scales of satisfaction. Educational achievement significantly differentiated satisfaction on the compensation and responsibility scales. Prior and current teaching also showed significant diffentiations on several scales. Overall social service, moral values, activity, and creativity were the more satisfying aspects of the work environment. The least satisfying aspects were those of compensation, advancement, school policies and practices, and recognition.

In 1978 Holdaway[62] conducted a study of 801 Alberta teachers with an instrument containing 59 satisfaction variables, 12 demographic variables, and 3 open-response questions. Holdaway reports that the highest satisfaction levels involve relationships with students, teachers, and administrators; freedom to select teaching methods, subject matter, and teaching materials; the teaching assignment; and job security. The highest dissatisfaction levels involved attitudes of society and parents; consultative and decision-making practices; available preparation time; and methods used in the evaluation and promotion of teachers. Results also showed that satisfaction is generally lower for males, for increasing grade levels, and for amount of training to two bachelor's degrees.

The major studies in the area of teacher job satisfaction as reviewed above are relevant to the present study for three reasons. First, they permit an overview of research conducted over many years with varying populations and samples showing the use of various instruments to measure teacher job satisfaction. Second, they provide a number of results which have been of immense importance in guiding and limiting the direction of the present study. And third, while the primary concern of this study was with personal/demographic and curricular influence results, this review will facilitate an appreciation of the larger context of variables related to teacher job satisfaction.

Special Aspects

In 1951 Coffman[63] undertook to relate teacher morale to curriculum development. Beginning with the Teacher Reaction Inventory developed at Columbia University he analyzed the items into ten subscales of which curriculum was one. The responses to the curriculum items were judged to be

ambiguous since a high satisfaction could reflect the presence of a highly satisfactory curriculum, the unwillingness to work for change, or the investment of earlier work. On other scales, teachers generally perceived their status as low, felt that routine demands were too great, and felt that pay was inadequate.

The satisfaction of team teachers was the special focus of a study by Diemert and Holdaway[64] in 1970. Using the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, 69 teachers in team-teaching situations were compared to 79 teachers in conventional situations. Results showed that the team teachers were significantly more satisfied on the scales of curriculum issues, community support of education, and school facilities. The team teachers were less satisfied with salary, but this may have been attributable to their lower age. Team teachers who had requested their appointment were more satisfied than those who had not requested it, but not significantly so.

Karolat[65] used a sample of 282 teachers to compare the job satisfaction of academic and non-academic staff in 1971. Analysis of the results obtained with the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire did not show significant differences for the two groups. The demographic variables of age, sex, and years of teaching experience were significant with older, female, and more experienced teachers shown to be more satisfied.

In 1968 Johnson[66] examined the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the socio-economic status of the school. With Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire results from 240 teachers, those from lower status schools rated significantly lower in satisfaction on the salary, curriculum issues, and community support of education subscales. The only aspect in which lower status school teachers scored higher satisfaction was the relationship with the principal. Concerning the differences in the curriculum scale, Johnson notes that these "are possibly an indication of the frustration of teachers in the low status schools with a curriculum which seems to have no relevance to the needs of the students with whom they deal"[67].

Three studies which specifically examined the effect of teacher-principal relations on teacher satisfaction were those of Chase, Campbell, and Fast. In the Chase[68] study, 88 percent of the respondents included dynamic leadership by the principal as a "factor contributing to satisfaction". Chase also noted that schools of high morale had teachers who emphasized such factors as principal helpfulness in solving problems of instruction and pupil adjustment, contributions to the professional growth of teachers, respect for the teacher's competence and democratic administration. Campbell's[69] study of 284 teachers and 15 principals examined the congruence of the expectations held by both toward the teacher's role. The 25 percent experiencing the highest teacher-principal congruence of expectations differed significantly in satisfaction with the 25 percent experiencing the lowest teacher-principal congruence. Fast[70] investigated the relationship between the congruence of the teacher's expectations and perceptions of leadership behavior and their satisfaction. Teachers who perceived their principals high in leadership abilities tended to be more satisfied, and the degree of satisfaction increased if such perceptions coincided with similar expectations.

As with the general studies of teacher job satisfaction these studies of special aspects have been important to the present study. The special attention given to curriculum while examining such factors as team teaching, academic versus non-academic job assignments, teacher-principal relations, and general teacher morale has been most useful in directing the construction of the second part of the questionnaire relating to curricular influences.

Participative Decision-Making Studies

One of the early studies concerned with the control of teachers over decision-making was carried out by O'Reilly[71] regarding areas of standardized practices. O'Reilly measured the need for autonomy of 216 elementary teachers in the areas of course content, pupil evaluation, and pupil control and discipline. His questionnaire also yielded the perceived degree of fulfillment of autonomy needs in these areas and satisfaction scores. The deficiencies calculated for the autonomy needs were greatest in the area of course content, less in pupil evaluation, and least in pupil discipline. The deficiency scores showed a significant negative correlation with the satisfaction scores, such that the greatest autonomy deficiency, in the area of course content, coincided with least satisfaction score.

Barrett[72] attempted to correlate overall job satisfaction as measured by the Brayfield-Rothe scale with 11 general decision-making items. His sample of 212 teachers in colleges and technical institutes revealed that there is a high expectancy on the part of faculty to participate in decision-making. While a full correlation between all the aspects of participation in decision-making and satisfaction could not be confirmed, general support was found for the contention that the greater respondents perceived their participation, the higher their job satisfaction.

Pellegrin[73] compared the satisfaction of the faculties of three multiunit schools with that of the faculties of three control schools. With regard to the five areas examined, the two groups differed in their decision-making modes: the multiunit school teachers generally reported more group decisions. On the 10-item job satisfaction scale the proportion of highly satisfied teachers was greater for the multiunit schools for seven items, while the two groups showed comparable ratings for the other three items. Correlating these two findings, Pellegrin concluded that "when groups are actually given the authority to make and to implement decisions that are significant for them, they make these decisions effectively, responsibly and enthusiastically...The multiunit school is clearly an example of an organization in which group decision-making has become an accomplished fact."[74]

Belasco and Alutto[75] calculated the discrepancies between the current and the preferred levels of decision-making of 424 teachers. The results were compared with job satisfaction as revealed in subject responses to four inducements to leave the job. The satisfaction scores were also compared with various organizational outcomes. Results showed that teachers who are decisionally deprived report significantly lower satisfaction levels and that satisfaction is negatively related to tension and militant attitudes.

In addition, this survey showed that satisfaction was differentially distributed in the teaching population with the factors of age, sex, and level of teaching being significant[76].

Career or overall satisfaction and professional satisfaction, resulting from the fulfillment of autonomy needs, were the variables studied by Hewitson[77]. Using a modified form of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire to measure the former and a 17-item questionnaire covering five decision areas to measure the latter, 332 teachers and principals were surveyed. The conclusions of the study reported that high levels of decision-making involvement were significantly associated with professional satisfaction but "not as significantly" related to career satisfaction.

Henderson[78] administered the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and a Psychological Participation Index developed by Vroom and Mann to 218 subjects. A significant positive relationship between participation in decision-making and job satisfaction was found for both scales. Other correlates of job satisfaction included positive feelings regarding the principal's competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

From a sample of 306 teachers and 30 principals, Devlin[79] also concluded that the level of participation in decision-making was significantly related to job satisfaction. This finding applied in over 30 areas of decision-making. In addition the principal was also isolated as an important mediating variable, as were the enrollment of the school, teacher age, and the teacher's own desire for participation.

The focus of the above studies on the decision-making processes in the school and on the level of teacher participation in such processes is directly linked to the specific areas of curricular influences and the teacher's perception of such influences. The matters of autonomy, need for autonomy, expectations, and organizational mechanisms, as dealt with in this previous research, have provided a basis for consolidating such influences for incorporation into the present study. Furthermore, the effects of such factors documented in these studies, such as tension, militancy, positive interpersonal relations, and professional satisfaction, have pointed to other values from examining curricular influences beyond the limit of job satisfaction as set in the present study.

C. General Studies of Teacher Attitude to Curriculum

Researching the attitudes of 240 foreign language teachers in Texas, Elmquist[80] found that while only 15.4 percent were dissatisfied with their teaching position, 67.5 percent expressed some dissatisfaction with the methods they were using and wished to try some other method. Concern with methods was also expressed in that 39.5 percent desired additional training in methods. In Alberta, Parker[81] employed only a small sample of 16 teachers but reported a 35 percent rate of dissatisfaction with the program being used. Possibly related to this was the finding that 20 percent of the teachers had no formal university preparation in terms of methods courses, while 40 percent had had only one course. Adding a cosmopolitan perspective

Santani[82] reported that 84 percent of a survey of Swiss teachers wanted further instruction in curriculum while 25 percent reported not having had any curriculum instruction during their teacher education.

Freedle[83] examined the attitudes of 130 teachers to a number of curriculum activities. The most positive attitudes were recorded toward the identification and study of students' needs and interests, the observation of other schools, the evaluation of curriculum programs, and serving on subject matter or grade level committees. The least positive attitudes were toward serving on objectives or coordinating committees as either a member or chairman, attending regional conferences, and writing courses of studies. Gardner[84] interviewed thirty teachers to determine their curriculum planning needs and found the greatest concern to be materials. The areas of content and methodology were also very important and secondary teachers expressed the need to exchange ideas with fellow teachers. Gardner also examined the consultation patterns of teachers in curriculum matters. Secondary teachers most frequently consulted their department head while elementary teachers turned to the school principal. Both groups consulted with fellow teachers and the librarian, while both viewed external curriculum workers as being of little help.

Three studies have focussed on the importance of the teacher's personal values and beliefs as they relate to the curriculum. Emans[85] contended that persons of divergent values could not, with equal feeling of approval, implement the same curriculum. Administering two value scales and a teacher attitude scale to 318 subjects he concluded that "differences in educational values among teachers appear to be reflected in teacher approval of their curriculum. The wider the differences in educational values among teachers of a school, the less approval of practices is experienced by the school's staff as a whole."[86] Papalia[87] used a two-part questionnaire with forty-five experienced foreign language teachers to determine their beliefs and their use of some current educational trends. The results showed a high degree of acceptance, belief, and implementation of self-pacing, small group work, behavioral objectives, mastery learning, and other concepts. A group of thirty-five prospective teachers also recorded their beliefs and showed stronger responses than the experienced teachers, but no behavioral measure was recorded for them.

Savignon, de Garcia, and Reynolds[88] developed the Foreign Language Attitude Survey as an instrument to probe the teacher's values. Savignon[89] suggested that the teacher's values might hamper student achievement in various ways. Specifically the teacher's emphasis on the academic value of language learning, the insistence on perfect grammar, and the need to "be in control" might not be conducive to producing communicative competence. De Garcia and Reynolds[90] added that in order to make effective educational decisions the teacher must be aware of his own values.

Studies of the implementation of curricular innovations have included examinations of the attitudes and reactions of teachers. Banning's[91] survey of sixty-five teachers noted that favorable attitudes to curriculum change depended on the teacher's sharing in policy-making, feeling the value of

his contribution to the change, and perceiving harmonious relations with students. Newton and Housego[92] polled 164 teachers and found that only 20 percent felt they had had enough share in the curriculum planning and 50 percent felt they had received insufficient assistance with implementation. Newton and Housego stressed in their conclusions the need for effective communication, coordinated implementation, and acessible assistance. The teachers must feel the need for change, be involved in the planning of the innovation, and given the time, knowledge, and materials to properly implement it. Herron[93] argued that the teacher's perception of new materials, including goals, philosophy, and structure, lies at the root of resistance to curriculum change. He pointed out that while most professional development activities relating to innovations assume that a change is wanted, that the rationale of the new program is understood, and that a commitment to the new materials exists, these assumptions are often false. His study of fifty teachers during a change in science curriculum revealed that only two were able to discuss the larger general context of science curricula and only six were able to show an adequate perception of the position taken by the materials they were teaching. Tom[94] discovered that even with a three-year program for the systematic implementation of a curriculum there arose serious problems. The process included the study of rationale, the comparison of specific programs, and analysis of materials, the adapting and piloting of the materials, evaluation, and eventual diffusion. Provisions were made for time, materials, and resource personnel. Nonetheless, Tom found that the rational analytic approach was ignored and teachers often resorted to immediate emotional and political considerations in decision-making. In addition their pragmatic considerations were hampered by not being able to identify possible and actual pedagogical problems. Tom concluded that "conceptions of educational change rarely have an empirical basis"[95] and maintained that they will continue to document failures rather than effective change as long as they are not based on reality.

Gabel and Rubba[96] surveyed thirty-six science teachers for attitude changes related to a four-week workshop. It was found that favorable changes in attitude to science teaching occurred, regardless of the specific program studied, but that these changes were not stable. No changes in general attitude to science were attributable to the workshop. Stern and Keisler[97] also maintained that workshops have little impact on changing attitudes. The fact that the main source of innovation is outside the classroom and beyond the control of teachers was deemed a determinant of negative attitudes. Stern and Keisler suggested that initial negative attitudes could be altered over time if knowledge, skills, and serious cognitive inputs (*viz.* reasons to change) were provided in a secure and accepting environment.

Fullan and Pomfret[98] conducted a systematic review of studies dealing with curriculum implementation. Four major determinants of the degree of implementation were found[99]. First, the nature of the innovation was important. The complexity of the change and its explicitness were possible sources of confusion, frustration, and low implementation. Second, the strategies of implementation, such as the provision of participation, training, resource support, and feedback, were essential. Third, the characteristics of the adopting unit, its climate, its population, and its structure were

significant influences. Fourth, the larger socio-political factors played an important role. Fullan and Pomfret concluded that mutal adaptation of users and managers was important in overcoming conflicts which are inevitable in the implementation process.

Hersom[100] summarized the dual possibility of problems for teachers when she stated:

> *... some of the reasons put forward for the failure (or at best partial failure) of a particular program in bringing about intended change usually run something like this: the teacher did not understand the philosophy and the assumptions underlying the new curriculum; teachers were not adequately prepared, that is, they did not have sufficient knowledge or teaching skill; teachers did not adhere to the guides of the developers; or the teachers' attitudes and values made them resistant to change. Less frequently is it reported that there was evidence that teachers indeed understood the underlying philosophy and assumptions and deliberately rejected the change on those grounds; that teachers set aside the guidelines prepared by the developers because they were unsuited to their pupils; or that it was patently impossible for teachers to familiarize themselves sufficiently with the new curriculum in order to implement it, given the unrelenting pressures of other school responsibilities. p. 4.*

In summary, then, the above studies have dealt with teacher attitudes to curriculum and with teacher attitudes involved in the implementation of curricular innovations. By their focus on the teacher's own values, beliefs, attitudes, and general role regarding curriculum, these studies offer a balance to many of the previously reviewed studies which have concentrated primarily on external factors. The controls present in their monitoring of specific attitudinal changes with curriculum changes provide a degree of validity for the inclusion of such attitudinal influences in the present study.

D. Curricular Influences

In addition to those aspects of the curriculum which have been specifically related to teacher attitudes, other aspects influencing the teacher in curriculum decisions exist. The studies which follow present variables which are of importance to the teacher, but which have not necessarily focussed on attitudes or satisfaction. These studies will be treated under the broad headings of situational and personal factors.

Situational Factors

Litwin and Stringer[101] introduced the concept of "organizational climate" to describe and summarize environmental factors which influence motivation and behavior. They contended that while motivation depends on individual expectations and situational factors, these are highly variable even over short periods of time, highly subjective, and difficult to measure. As a more molar concept they proposed that organizational climate could provide a useful bridge connecting theories of individual motivation and theories of behavior and organizations. The eight dimensions of organizational climate which Litwin and Stringer isolated were (1) structure and constraint; (2) emphasis on individual responsibility; (3) warmth and support; (4) rewards and punishment; (5) conflict and tolerance for conflict: (6) performance standards and expectations: (7) organizational loyalty; and (8) risk taking.

The question of structure was discussed by Whitely[102] in reference to the separation of specialists and teachers in curriculum development. Whitely suggested that this functional division, whereby teachers are viewed solely as implementors and only specialists are involved in development, is inadequate. Connelly[103] also noted that in curriculum development teachers are generally viewed as "filterers or modifiers of curriculum messages". He added that the teachers' "most common role is to provide the experimental classrooms in which the developer can try out his ideas and evaluate their effects upon learning...For the most part the teacher is the guinea pig through whom the developer tries to validate his convictions."[104] MacDonald and Rudduck[105] also highlighted this structural division noting that "curriculum development teams, particularly in America, evince a pattern of development and diffusion in which a finished program, by virtue of the prestige and authority of its originators, is carried intact through the diffusion chain to the classroom."[106] Fullan[107] summarized the main impact of such a structure stating: "The main conclusion is that the model process of change whereby innovations are developed external to schools and then transmitted to them has led to no significant change at the user level."[108] From a survey of forty-seven teachers, Haller[109] found that teachers are willing to try out new ideas but that they generally do not place much credibility in the usual exterior sources of ideas: universities, specialists, and administrators. Justice[110] added that teachers with greater contact with "system level personnel" were more likely to be knowledgeable and accepting of innovations from those sources.

A parallel structural factor addressed by Justice[111] concerned the degree of administrative decision-making control. Justice found that teachers who reported the administrative staff as exerting high decision-making control were more apt to exhibit less knowledge and less experience with regard to the Social Studies innovations being considered. Results of studies by Sharma[112], Sinks[113], Massé[114], Corriveau[115], Clarke[116], Hawley[117], Simpkins and Friesen[118], Burns[119], and Truesdell[120], all concurred that teachers perceive decision-making to take place at a higher level than the preferred level expressed by teachers. These studies have shown a general desire for decisions to be made at a level "closer to the classroom" with more teacher participation. However, a desire for total

autonomy did not exist. Simpkins and Friesen found that "evidence indicated that teachers wanted decisions made close to the level of operation"[121], reflecting the idea that those who are responsible for an area should have the authority to make decisions within that area. Pursuing this concept these authors and Massé[122] have found that professionals, those who perceive and undertake a greater range of responsibility for themselves, express a greater desire for authority in making decisions. Truesdell[123] similarly found that differences existed in individual teachers in their desire for greater participation in decision-making. Approximately 20 percent of her 210 teacher sample reported being satisfied or desiring less participation in decision-making.

Differences in the acceptance of responsibility have been the subject of other studies on professionalism and bureaucracy. Corwin[124] developed an index to measure the professional, as opposed to the employee or bureaucratic, conceptions of teachers. From 279 questionnaire replies and 141 interviews, Corwin concluded that initiative-taking teachers subscribe to significantly more professional and fewer bureaucratic roles than do compliant ones. Mawter[125], using the same scale, polled 274 teachers and reported an inverse relationship between professionalism and the teacher's satisfaction with supervision. Also, teachers in schools having hierarchical decision structures were not satisfied with their level of involvement in the decision-making process. Similar findings were reported by Max[126] whose sampling of 400 teachers showed that those having a high professional attitude were found to have a low attitude to bureaucracy and vice versa. Gosine and Keith[127] selected seventy teachers from schools representing the extremes of the bureaucratic continuum and examined their scores on questionnaires of basic needs and satisfaction. Results for the need for dominance and the need for order were significant. Low bureaucratic schools provided more satisfaction for teachers with a high need for dominance and with a low need for order. Gosine and Keith also grouped three needs into a cluster labelled need for independence and determined that teachers with high independence needs were more satisfied in low bureaucratic schools while teachers with low independence needs were more satisfied in high bureaucratic schools.

The elements of warmth and support in organizational climate have frequently been mentioned in articles dealing with the effective implementation of innovations. Unfortunately, considering these as affect factors, most of the statements made have been opinions and suggestions[128]. As a concrete factor, support from consultants has been researched. Bjork[129] observed twenty-four teachers of whom half had received assistance and direction from a curriculum consultant. Bjork found that the teachers who had interacted with consultants rated higher in all four of the dimensions of implementation considered by tending to teach more behavioral objectives, having greater course content, using a wider variety of learning activities, and making greater use of resource materials. In her survey of 240 teachers, Elmquist[130] found that teachers expressed a concern over their lack of contact with a foreign language consultant. In examining the perceptions and attitudes of 363 teachers toward a district curriculum planning body, Skobjak[131] determined that 66.5 percent of the respondents rated it as

effective. Those criticizing the committee, however, noted its failure to "bring together" members of the whole school staff and its lack of support for teachers' inputs and work. Further concrete support, in terms of instructional resources, was found to be a major determinant of teachers' curricular decisions by Jeffares[132] and by Pylypiw[133]. Their findings suggest that material support can influence the direction and the success of curricular innovations. Pylypiw also contended that provincial guidelines were influential among teachers, whereas 72 percent of Jeffares' sample reported using the curriculum handbook only once or twice.

The entire field of satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be considered relevant to the next climate factor, rewards and punishments. Variables which have been assumed capable of acting as motivators and the effects of such variables have been previously reviewed. With specific regard to curriculum, Bolam[134] noted that curriculum innovations demand large teacher investments of time, effort and status without any guarantee of success or reward. He further suggested that incentives to change are necessary if the innovation is to appear more attractive than the *status quo* situation.

The factor of conflict is one which may affect the teacher in several spheres. Getzels and Guba[135] examined role conflicts relating to socio-economic, citizen, and professional matters. Their 71-item conflict questionnaire was answered by 166 subjects and revealed numerous demographic and situational variables at work. Getzels and Guba concluded that role conflict was definitely a source of "frustration for the individual teacher and ineffectiveness for the educational institution"[136]. Shirk[137] argued the teacher often places conflicting demands on pupils due to varying pressures perceived by the teacher. Educational, intellectual, political, and contextual demands as well as the teacher's attitudes result in a "hidden curriculum" such as the implicit lessons teaching the student to conform to the community's religious views or the teacher's personal political beliefs, lessons which may conflict with the actual curriculum. McKeown[138] documented several American court cases in which teachers had persisted in teaching a curriculum which differed from the official curriculum. McKeown noted the findings that neither the right of free speech nor academic freedom swayed the case that legally the teacher's role is to implement set curricula. Studies such as those of Sinks[139], Corriveau[140], and others, concerning levels of decision-making, have revealed areas of conflict. This conflict has been documented not only regarding the actual level of decision-making, but also the preferred level. Johnston and Yeakey[141] surveyed 313 teachers and twenty-three administrators and found that the two groups expressed divergent choices for staff development topics and regarding who should organize staff development programs. Combining this conflict with the fact that staff development programs are decided upon and organized by the administration but attended primarily by the teacher, Johnston and Yeakey concluded that this needs to be considered as a reason for the ineffectiveness of staff development programs. In contrast to these findings, however, Smart[142] found that a sample of 804 subjects did not show administrators and faculty to have significantly different institutional goals.

Studies dealing with the congruence of beliefs may be considered relevant to the question of conflict. Yuskiewicz and Willower[143] administered a pupil control ideology questionnaire and job satisfaction index to 910 subjects. The congruence between the teacher's beliefs and those of his colleagues and his principal were significantly related to the teacher's satisfaction. Burstall[144] reported that the congruence of teacher and principal beliefs regarding the capacity of low achievers to learn French was significantly reflected in the actual achievement of such pupils. Masajan[145] found that an initial congruence of student and instructor beliefs regarding the behaviorist nature of psychology was related to higher student achievement. Masajan did not find that a convergence of student and instructor beliefs during the course resulted in higher student achievement. Bush[146] also did not find that a match of pupil and teacher interests resulted in higher pupil achievement. The Bush study of twenty-seven teachers and 650 pupils did show that a match of interests correlated with higher pupil-teacher rapport. A study of seventy-four teachers and twenty-two curriculum leaders by Martin[147] showed a significant lack of congruence in their views of the teacher's role in cooperative curriculum development. Martin maintained that the divergence of their views was indicative of role conflict. Thus the degree of congruence of beliefs between the teacher and his administration, his colleagues, his students, the experts, and the community, all provide the opportunity for conflicts capable of affecting achievement, harmony, and satisfaction.

Standards and expectations as a factor of organizational climate have received much attention since the study of Rosenthal and Jacobsen[148]. These researchers administered a test to 370 students which was supposedly capable of predicting imminent learning spurts. In fact, the test was a measurement of intelligence quotient. Arbitrarily 20 percent of the students were identified as "spurters" and were pointed out to their teachers. When the same test of intelligence quotient was administered one year later a significant number of students identified as "spurters" showed significant gains in intelligence quotient. The results of Rosenthal and Jacobsen have been much contested and attempts at replication have not shown such dramatic results. However, in a review of twenty-five such studies by Elashoff and Snow[149], positive expectancy results have been found for teacher behavior in fourteen out of seventeen studies, for student achievement in six out of nine studies, and for student behavior in three out of six studies. Pidgeon[150], in a large comparative study of the basic attainments in arithmetic with almost 7,000 children in England and Wales; California, U.S.A.; and Queensland, Australia suggested that expectation was an important variable in explaining differences. Generally the Australian children outperformed the British children who greatly outperformed the American children. Pidgeon assumed that all of the children possessed the same capacities for learning and looked to the curriculum for differences. Pidgeon found that the California curriculum was indeed behind that of England and Wales for all but one of the examination items. Pidgeon concluded that because less was expected of the children in America the curriculum had more limited objectives and teachers placed less emphasis on higher achievement. Because less was expected of the American students, they produced less. Similarly, Pidgeon noted that the British children who

are streamed according to ability showed a much wider range of achievement than American and Australian children who are grade placed. Pidgeon concluded that less is expected of lower stream children in the British system resulting in the wider range of achievement. Pidgeon[151] pursued the question of expectations in further studies and found that the general school atmosphere, the pupils' own aspirations, and cultural variables all have an effect on achievement by setting expectations and standards. As has already been noted, Burstall[152] found that the expectation of success was related to positive outcomes in the teaching of French to low ability students, especially if the teacher and the head of the school held high expectations. Describing a three-year experiment involving 742 teachers and 2,000 low achieving students, Kerman[153] reported that the teachers were trained to hold more expectations and higher expectations for such students. Results showed that the students in the experimental classes showed significant improvements in academic achievement, decreased absenteeism, and better behavior. It should be noted that the teachers' expectations were assumed to be manifested in specific behaviors, such as more questioning, allow more time for responding, prompting and probing, which were increased with the given students. A study by Tamir and Jungwirth[154] sampled 107 biology teachers to determine their expectations of achieving the objectives which they deemed most important. The ranking of fourteen objectives according to importance and chance of being achieved showed that only ten percent equated their priorities with their expectations. The researchers concluded that "for the great majority of teachers, the score of this index... (shows) a great disparity between teachers' views on teaching objectives *per se* and their expectations to transform these objectives into reality"[155]. Finally, a study by Brophy[156] of thirty-one teachers, which involved observations, interviews, and interaction analysis as well as standardized tests, revealed that high teacher expectation regarding student performance and independence correlated with high student achievement gains. Brophy and Good[157] summarized some of these findings and suggested a model for teacher expectancy effects by incorporating many of the above factors.

Concerning the factor of organizational loyalty, there appears to be little research in the field of education. The study conducted by Belasco and Alutto[158] presented the subjects with four inducements to leave the organization. The results were considered as giving the measurement of job satisfaction. Other studies which have been reviewed[159] have examined the problem of staff turnover. As variables within the school, however, these indices of loyalty have generally been approached as outcomes of the organizational climate rather than determinants of it.

The research directly focussed on risk taking as a variable of organizational climate is very sparse. Young[160] has suggested that teachers are primarily oriented to implement a given curriculum with a given group and curriculum development work is perceived as detracting from classroom duties. Haller[161] found that, given a "gift" of ten extra hours, very few teachers would use them for innovative or developmental curricular work. Nonetheless, Haller did maintain that teachers were constantly producing

new ideas in their classrooms, but noted that these ideas could not diffuse through the system due to the lack of time which teachers have to professionally interact with each other. Corwin's[162] study determined that it is possible to identify initiative-taking teachers and other studies have identified teachers ascribing to more professional and more responsible roles. Most of these studies, however, concur with Young that the organizational structure, the administrations' views, and the teacher's daily demands prevent the fruition of such aspirations.

To summarize, then, a number of studies exist which have not stemmed from a direct concern over teacher job satisfaction but which have raised factors that might be important to it. The concept of organizational climate was used as a guide to explore elements relevant to the curriculum which could possibly affect job satisfaction. Specifically, the areas of organizational structure, roles, standards, support systems, areas of conflict, types of compensation, and resources, all yielded a number of important curricular influences in the school situation whose effect on the organizational climate might also be found in the individual teacher's job satisfaction.

Personal Factors

Having examined a number of the external influences which the teacher may perceive in making curriculum choices, there remain the internal, personal factors of individual teachers which may be influential.

The majority of studies which have been reviewed have included a certain number of biographical items. Beecher[163] specifically studied such items in relation to curriculum practices and concluded that ethnicity, education, and experience were all influential factors. Lazarowitz[164] examined the length of curriculum use in determining teacher attitudes to the curriculum and found a positive correlation. Dangharn[165] separated the teacher's experience in his current school from the teacher's total teaching experience and found it to be an important factor. Oberg[166] grouped a large number of items as the teacher's "previous experience" and determined this factor to be one of the two most important referents in curriculum planning. Many studies, like that of Belasco and Alutto[167], have found age and sex to be related to decisional participation and job satisfaction. Others, like Butler[168], have found that marital status may have an effect on curriculum involvement and satisfaction.

A number of authors have suggested that the teacher's knowledge may have a bearing on his general success. Truex[169] used 144 students as reporters of effective and ineffective college teaching experiences. Analysis of the responses showed that the teacher's knowledge of the subject matter was rated the second most important factor. On the basis of student achievement Politzer and Wise[170] identified two groups of foreign language teachers by their success. An examination of forty variables showed that optimum performance in aural comprehension and previous residence in France correlated with success, suggesting that competence in the subject was an important factor. Similarly, Tardif[171] demonstrated that the teacher's

cultural knowledge may be an important determinant in the teaching of culture. At a time when the teaching of cultural awareness was the first goal of Alberta's provincial curriculum, Tardif surveyed 110 French teachers and found that 55 percent of the respondents rated the lack of familiarity with the culture as a major obstacle to the teaching of it. Concerning knowledge of curriculum theory, Huenecke[172] classified twenty-one teachers and observed their classes and lesson plans. The results showed that by ratings on Bloom's taxonomy the more knowledgeable teachers operated at higher, more cognitive taxonomic levels than the less knowledgeable teachers. However, in testing fifty teachers on their knowledge of standard learning theory, Aspy[173] arrived at a conflicting conclusion. Comparing the teachers' learning theory scores with an analysis of actual teaching behaviors, Aspy found very little statistical correlation between the two. A final aspect of teacher knowledge was revealed by Reeves[174] who studied the textbook selection procedures used by Canadian provinces in 1967. Reeves discovered that even the members of the textbook selection committees had severely limited access to the curriculum developers and publishers. Reeves concluded that the lack of communication and resultant lack of knowledge created serious problems. While this study focussed on the provincial curriculum committees, it may be assumed that results of poor information exchange at this level would only be intensified at the level of the classroom teacher.

A number of researchers have explored the question of personality traits and their manifestation in teaching style. Solomon, Bezdek, and Rosenberg[175] isolated eight factors which might be used to characterize teachers, namely, lethargic-energetic, aggressive-protective, obscure-clear, participative-lecturing, dry-flamboyant, warm-cold, open-closed, and permissive-controlling. An examination of twenty-four teachers revealed that their success was related to an interaction of the style characteristics with the use of different textbooks. A relationship was also found between the factors of style and the types of gain made by the students. Morris[176] also examined teaching success and personality factors and found that good teachers tended to be more venturesome and imaginative. Morris did not compare different outcomes to test for a differential effect of these factors, but he noted that the factors might be a reflection of a compatability with, and commitment to, a specific methodology. Houston[177] evaluated two groups of students having been taught in an "open-minded" indirect style and a traditional, direct, expository style. While the indirectly taught students generally outperformed the others, Houston noted that the differences were never very large and the results of the expository students tended to be more consistent for the four tests used. Smith[178] also discussed two specific styles of teaching, gestalt and encounter-based, and noted that each has its advantages, concluding that "there is no one way to teach"[179]. Peterson, Marx, and Clark[180] studied twelve teachers in test situations and noted the presence of stable planning differences for individual teachers. They further concluded that "individual differences in teacher planning do seem to be related to differences in the teachers' cognitive processing styles"[181]. Hounshell and Dieter[182] and Noad[183] examined the self concept of teachers and found a relationship between certain personality factors and effectiveness. However, Noad concluded that teacher preparation programs should be designed to assist prospective teachers to use their own styles of behavior to best advantage. Henry[184] implied the same suggestion

upon noting that various curricula usually do not surpass each other in effectiveness[185] but that individual teachers do. Henry argued that the teacher evaluation process should be directed at helping the teacher develop and capitalize on his own style rather than simply use evaluation to criticize or to determine tenure.

The extent of teacher participation in curriculum planning and decision-making and its effects has been briefly reviewed as an element of the work situation. Other studies have concentrated on examining the teacher's perception of such involvement as a mediating factor to its importance. Nault[186] found that the involvement of the teacher in developing curricular materials was closely related to the extent of subsequent teacher use, but with several notable exceptions. The teacher might perceive his involvement to be a sham or "window dressing", a "rubber stamping", an unnecessary exercise, or as a means to unrelated rewards such as promotion. In these cases, Nault found that teacher involvement acted detrimentally on subsequent use of the materials developed. Johansen's[187] study of 195 Illinois teachers showed similar results. Teacher participation in curriculum decision-making correlated significantly with subsequent implementation, but the teacher's perception of his influence did affect the degree of significance. If the teacher's influence was perceived as being of a functional type, "based on the necessity of the teachers' contributions"[188], the likelihood of implementation decreased. Also, a hierarchical type of influence showed a correlation with a lower degree of implementation. In an examination of some of the literature dealing with teacher participation in decision-making, Miklos[189] found most studies to support increased involvement but cautioned that research had also shown that some teachers do not want to accept responsibility in certain areas. This may be related to the finding reported by Simson, Poncelow, and McLure[190] that only 69 percent of the teachers felt knowledgeable enough to propose curriculum changes. Another possible consideration, raised by the findings of Lamont's[191] study of twenty-four industrial arts teachers, was that while involved teachers might have a better knowledge of the curriculum guide, they did not report it to be more valuable nor did they use it more frequently. Lamont did report that the participating teachers did use the curriculum guide in a greater variety of ways than those not participating in its development.

A final set of possible curricular influences which is usually included in the "personal information" portion of questionnaires concerns several demographic characteristics. Belasco and Alutto[192] found the grade level of teachers related to satisfaction with decisional participation. Hoppock[193] found the size of the community, and Bridges[194] found the size of the school to have an impact on general satisfaction and degree of decisional involvement respectively. Holdaway[195] found urban, as opposed to rural, teachers to be more satisfied. Young[196] suggested that the number of subjects taught would affect the degree of curriculum participation of teachers. Yuskiewicz[197] included questions regarding the subject's area of specialization and whether this had been done within the field of education. The subject's affiliation with professional organizations was a question asked by Lacy[198] and also included by Tardif[199]. Lacy also examined the impact of class size and the number of departmental colleagues

in the same school. Francoeur[200] included questions regarding subject scheduling and studies on semestering have shown that this may be a relevant factor in the Alberta setting. While these demographic factors might better be viewed as situational variables, many of them reflect the personal condition of the teacher rather than the organization as a whole. Whatever the arbitrary classification, such factors as these have been found important components of the teacher's framework in making decisions.

Thus, regarding personal factors, a number of studies exist which have explored their importance in such areas as curriculum practices, student achievement, organizational effectiveness, teaching style, and decision-making, among others. Many of these studies did not specifically examine the effect of personal factors on teacher job satisfaction. However, since the areas explored have elsewhere shown links with teacher job satisfaction, those factors which showed a major impact on these areas were considered and incorporated into this study.

In conclusion, then, previous research relevant to the present study had been done in the areas of general job satisfaction, specific teacher job satisfaction, general teacher attitudes to curriculum, and in the area of curriculum itself. The studies in the general domain of job satisfaction revealed a series of models of job satisfaction, each of which measure the concept differently. Specifically, in view of the problem of establishing reliable representative facets of teaching, and in view of the problem of weighting, the use of a global measure appeared to avoid such controversy. By using the Brayfield-Rothe Index of Job Satisfaction which had been tested for reliability and validity, and by adding a self-rating item and a behavioral measure to provide a final degree of control to the Brayfield-Rothe Index, it was felt that the scores so obtained could be used with confidence.

The studies in the specific area of teacher job satisfaction and in the areas of teacher attitudes to curriculum and the curriculum itself have been the primary source for the personal/demographic and curricular influence items which were included in the questionnaire of the present study. The previous research on teacher job satisfaction did not present a consistent list of factors significantly related to satisfaction. However, these studies did permit the identification of factors worthy of further consideration. And in addition, they did permit an overview of the larger area in which the specific aspect of curricular influences is located. Similarly, the studies concerning curriculum and teacher attitudes to curriculum have provided an overview of the area in which the aspect of job satisfaction is located. Also, these studies of teacher needs, school structure, expectations, roles, curriculum planning and practices, resources, compensation, and many other aspects affecting the teacher, were all sources of curricular influences and relevant personal/demographic variables which related to the present study. Consideration of these many aspects of job satisfaction, the teacher, and the curriculum in turn lead to consideration of the specific methodology employed in this study.

NOTES

1. J.P. Wanous; E.E. Lawler, "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Volume 52, Number 2, April 1972.

2. E. Mayo, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Society,* New York, MacMillan Compony, 1933.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 74.

4. Where "J.S." refers to job satisfaction, "J.F.S." refers to satisfaction with specific facets of the job, and "ξ" expresses the summation of the factors in parentheses.

   Similar formulations will be used without explanation for other conceptions of job satisfaction with the notation for component facets evident from the text.

5. P.C. Smith; L.M. Kendall; C.L. Hulin, *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement,* Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1969.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

7. C.P. Alderfer, "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* Volume 4, Number 2, May 1969. pp. 142-175.

8. See J.P. Conroy (1975) and Knoop; O'Reilly (1976) who argue that the Job Descriptive Index does not tap all facets for teachers.

9. A.H. Brayfield; H.F. Rothe, "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Volume 35, Number 5, October 1951.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

11. T. Kunin, "The Construction of a New Type of Attitude Measure", *Personnel Psychology,* Volume 8, 1955. pp. 65-77.

12. E.A. Locke, "What is Job Satisfaction?" *Organizational Behavior and Performance,* Volume 4, Number 4, November 1969.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 329.

14. R.H. Schaffer, "Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work", *Psychology Monographs,* Volume 67, Number 14 (364), 1953.

15. V. Vroom, *Work and Motivation,* New York, Wiley, 1964.

16. R.B. Ewen, "Weighting Components of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Volume 51, Number 1, February 1967, pp. 68-73.

17. P.S. Mikes; C.L. Hulin, "Use of Importance as a Weighting Component of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 52, Number 5, October 1968. pp. 394-398.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 398.

19. W.H. Mobley; E.A. Locke, "The Relationship of Value Importance to Satisfaction", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Volume 5, Number 5, September 1970.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 480.

21. Locke, *Op. cit.*, 1969, pp. 316-317.

22. Schaffer, *Op. Cit.*, 1953, p. 3.

23. L.W. Porter, "A Study of Perceived Need Satisfaction in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 45, Number 1, February 1961.

24. A.H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation", *Psychological Review*, Volume 50, Number 4, 1943.

25. L.W. Porter, "Job Attitudes in Management: II, Perceived Importance of Needs as a Function of Job Level", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 47, Number 2, April 1963.

26. L.W. Porter; E.E. Lawler, *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*, Homewood, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1968.

27. F. Herzberg; B. Mausner; B.B. Snyderman, *The Motivation to work*, New York, Wiley, 1959.

28. L.W. Porter; E.E. Lawler; J.R. Hackman, *Behavior in Organizations*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975.

29. V.H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, New York, Wiley 1964, p. 129.

30. J.T. Hazer, "Job Satisfaction: A Possible Integration of Two Theories", *Training and Development Journal*, Volume 30, Number 7, July 1976.

31. P.F. Wernimont, "A Systems View of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 56, Number 2, 1972.

32. T. Sergiovani, "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Volume 5, Number 1, May 1967.

33. R.A. Wickstrom, "Sources of Teacher Job Satisfaction", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 13, Number 1, October 1973.

34. G.L. Schmidt, "Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 12, Number 12, Spring 1976.

35. B.J. Passalacqua, *Teacher Job Satisfaction Based on the Herzberg Theory*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1970.

36. P.J. Andrisani, *Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience*, New York, Praeger, 1978.

37. L.H. Lofquist; R.V. Dawis, *Adjustment to Work*, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

38. Locke, *Op. Cit.*, 1969.

39. V.H. Vroom, "Industrial Social Psychology" in: *Management and Motivation*, V.H. Vroom; E.L. Deci (eds.), Kingsport, Penguin Books, 1970. p. 96 ff.

40. B. Iris; G. Barrett, "Some Relations Between Job and Life Satisfaction and Job Importance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 56, Number 4, 1972.

41. C. Miskel; D. Glasnapp; R. Hatley, "A Test of the Inequity Theory for Job Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 11, Number 1, Winter 1975.

42. E. Mumford, *Job Satisfaction: A Study of Computer Specialists*, London, Longman, 1972.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

44. H.J. Leavitt, "Unhuman Organizations", in: Vroom; Deci (eds.), *Op. Cit.*, 1970.

45. J.G. March; H.A. Simon, "Motivational Constraints: The Decision to Participate", *Ibid.*

46. R. Hoppock, *Job Satisfaction*, New York, Harper, 1935.

47. H.Y. McClusky; F.J. Strayer, "Reactions of Teachers to the Teaching Situation: A Study of Job Satisfaction", *The School Review*, Volume 48, Number 8, October 1940.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 623.

49. F.S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching", *Phi Delta Kappan*, 33, November 1951.

50. J.F. Aikenhead, "Teacher Satisfactions and Discouragements", *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 6, Number 2, June 1960.

51. T.M. Butler, "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers", *Clearing House*, Volume 36, Number 1, September 1961.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

53. Butler, *Loc. Cit.*

54. J.W. McLaughlin; J.T. Shea, "California Teachers' Job Dissatisfactions", *California Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 11, Number 5, November 1960.

55. K. Francoeur, *Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

56. A.E.N. Okonkwa, *A Study of Teachers' Attitudes and Their Relation to Work Satisfaction*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

57. A. Remple; R.R. Bentley, "Teacher Morale: Relationship with Selected Factors", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter 1970.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 539.

59. A. Lacy, "Teacher Job Satisfaction: Factors and Implications", *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, Volume 15, Number 4, August 1973.

60. R.J. Murnane; B.R. Phillips, "The School as a Workplace: What Matters to Teachers", *Mathematics Policy Research and the University of Pennsylvania*, 1977.

61. F.J. Hadaway, *Selected Personal Characteristics Related to Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Teachers*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

62. E.A. Holdaway, *Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1978.

63. W.E. Coffman, "Teacher Morale and Curriculum Development: A Statistical Analysis of Responses to a Reaction Inventory", *Journal of Experimental Education*, Volume 19, Number 4, June 1951.

64. N.E. Diemert; E.A. Holdaway, "Teacher Satisfaction in Team and Conventional Teaching Situations", *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 16, Number 2, June 1970.

65. H.G. Karolat, *Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Comprehensive Schools in Saskatchewan*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

66. B.K. Johnson, *An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools,* unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

68. F.S. Chase, "Professional Leadership and Teacher Morale", *Administrator's Notebook,* Volume 1, Number 8, March 1953.

69. M.V. Campbell, "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role", *Administrator's Notebook,* Volume 7, Number 6, February 1959.

70. R.G. Fast, *Leader Behavior of Principals as it Relates to Teacher Satisfaction,* unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

71. R.R. O'Reilly, *A Study of Teacher Attitudes Concerning Standardized Practices in Instructional Areas,* unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.

72. T.C. Barrett, *Relationship Between Perceived Faculty Participation in the Decision-Making Process and Job Satisfaction in the Community Colleges of North Carolina,* unpublished Ed.D. thesis, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1969.

73. R.J. Pellegrin, *Professional Satisfaction and Decision-Making in the Multiunit School,* Eugene, Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.

74. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

75. J.A. Belasco; J.A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly,* Volume 8, Number 1, Winter 1972.

76. Belasco and Alutto also noted that not all groups desired to participate in decision-making.

77. M.T. Hewitson, *The Professional Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers,* unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.

78. L.F. Henderson, *Elementary Teacher Satisfaction and Morale and Perceived Participation in Decision Making,* unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Arkansas, 1976.

79. B.S. Devlin, *Teacher Participation in Decision-Making and Its Relationship to the Variables Job Satisfaction Organizational Commitment, Job Tension and Attitudinal Militancy,* unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1978.

80. A.M. Elmquist, "The Foreign Language Teacher: Background and Attitudes", *Foreign Language Annals,* Volume 6, Number 4, May 1973.

81. D.V. Parker, "Study Eleven: Teacher Program Attitudes, Pre- and In-Service Preparation, and Priorities in the French Curriculum", *An Assessment of the Program in French as a Second Language* (monograph), University of Alberta, 1975.

82. B. Santani, "Attitudes of Swiss Teachers Towards the Study and Planning of the Curriculum", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Volume 5, Number 2, November 1973.

83. S.D. Freedle, *An Exploration of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Selected Activities in Organized Curriculum Improvement*, unpublished D.Ed. thesis, University of Tennessee, 1971.

84. R.M. Gardner, *Curriculum Planning Needs of Teachers*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971.

85. R. Emans, "Teacher Attitudes as a Function of Values", *Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 62, Number 10, July/August 1969.

86. *Ibid.*, p. 462.

87. A. Papalia, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Current Trends in Foreign Language Instruction", *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Volume 32, Number 3, January 1977.

88. S.J. Savignon; R. de Garcia; S. Reynolds, "Foreign Language Attitude Survey", *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Volume 32, Number 3, February 1976.

89. S.J. Savignon, "On the Other Side of the Desk: A Look at Teachers Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning", *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Volume 32, Number 3, February 1976.

90. R. de Garcia; S. Reynolds, "Foreign Language Teachers' Attitudes: a Strategy for Exploration and Change", *Foreign Language Annals*, Volume 10, Number 6, December 1977.

91. E.I. Banning, "Teacher Attitudes Toward Curriculum Change: The Effects of Personal Relationships on the Degree of Favorableness", *Journal of Experimental Education*, Volume 23, Number 2, December 1954.

92. E.E. Newton; I.E. Housego, "Teacher Reaction to Change: A Case Study", *Canadian Administrator*, Volume 6, Number 7, April 1967.

93. M. Herron, "On Teacher Perception and Curricular Innovations", *Curriculum Theory Network*, Volume 7, 1971.

94. A. Tom, "Teacher Reaction to a Systematic Approach to Curriculum Implementation", *Curriculum Theory Network*, Number 11, Spring 1973.

95. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

96. D. Gabel; P. Rubba, "Attitude Changes of Elementary Teachers According to the Curriculum Studies During Workshop Participation and Their Role as Model Science Teachers", *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Volume 16, Number 1, January 1979.

97. C. Stern; E. Keisler, "Teacher Attitudes and Attitude Change", *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Volume 10, Number 2, Winter 1977.

98. M. Fullan; A. Pomfret, "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation", *Review of Educational Research*, Volume 47, Number 2, Winter 1977.

99. Very similar findings resulted from a three-year study of a language arts implementation program by J.J. Simms, *The Dynamics of the Implementation of Curricular Innovations*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

100. N. Hersom "Coping with Curriculum Change", *Elements: Translating Theory into Practice*, Volume 6, Number 2, October 1974.

101. G.H. Litwin; R.A. Stringer, Jr., *Motivation and Organizational Climate*, Boston, Harvard University, 1968.

102. T. Whitely, "A Model for Pre-Implementation Study of Curriculum Programs", *Curriculum Theory Network*, Number 7, 1971.

103. F.M. Connelly, "Curriculum Decision-Making by Teachers", *Canadian Society for the Study of Education Bulletin*, Volume 2, Number 1, January 1975.

104. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

105. B. MacDonald; J. Rudduck, "Curriculum Research and Development Projects: Barriers to Success", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Volume 41, Number 2, June 1971.

106. *Ibid.*, p. 148.

107. M. Fullan cited in R. Bolam, "The Type of Environment Most Likely to the Active and Effective Participation of Teachers in Educational Innovation", in: *Teachers as Innovators*, Paris, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 1976.

108. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

109. E.G. Haller, *Strategies for Change* (monograph), Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Department of Education Administration), 1969.

110. B.F. Justice, *The Impact of Selected Structural Characteristics of Schools Upon Teacher Response to Innovative Social Studies Curricula*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978.

111. *Ibid.*

112. C.L. Sharma, *Practices in Decision-Making as Related to Satisfaction in Teaching*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1955.

113. R.W. Sinks, *Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Organizational and Administrative Decision-Making in a Sampling of Indiana Public Elementary Schools*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Indiana, 1967.

114. M. Massé, *Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

115. R.L. Corriveau, *A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual and Preferred Degree of Teacher Participation in a Number of Decisions*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

116. G.A. Clarke, *Teacher Perceptions of School Decision-Making Roles*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

117. G.B. Hawley, *Actual and Preferred Levels of Curriculum Decision-Making as Perceived by Selected Groups*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

118. W.S. Simpkins; D. Friesen, "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 8, Number 4, January 1969.

119. W.J. Burns, *The Emerging Role of the Teacher in Curriculum Policy Formation and Decision-Making in the State of New Jersey*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Fordham University, 1970.

120. D.D. Truesdell, *A Study of the Relationship Between Participation in Decision-Making and the Recognition of the Legitimacy of Administrative Influence*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland, 1978.

121. Simpkins; Friesen, *Op. Cit.*, 1969, p. 15.

122. Massé, *Op. Cit.*, 1969.

123. Truesdell, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

124. R.G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education", *Sociology of Education*, Volume 38, Number 4, Summer 1965.

125. P.T. Mawter, *Teacher Professionalism and Decision-Making Modes in Selected Elementary Schools as Determinant of Job Satisfaction*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oregon.

126. R.H. Max, *Teacher Attitudes Toward Bureaucracy, Professionalism and Militancy*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 1978.

127. M. Gosine; M.V. Keith, "Bureaucracy, Teacher Personality Needs, and Teacher Satisfaction", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 10, Number 1, October 1970.

128. R. O'Toole, "Implementing New Science Programs", *Science and Children*, Volume 12, Number 3, November/December 1974.

Bolam, *Op. Cit.*, 1976.

129. W.E. Bjork, *A Study of the Influence of the Role of the Curriculum Consultant on Curriculum Implementation*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1970.

130. Elmquist, *Op. Cit.*, 1973.

131. B.L.N. Skobjak, *Perceptions and Attitudes of Staff Members Towards a District-Wide Curriculum Planning Commission*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1978.

132. D. Jeffares, *A Descriptive Study of Teacher Decisions in Curriculum Development*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1973.

133. J.A. Pylypiw, *A Description of Classroom Curriculum Development*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1974.

134. Bolam, *Op. Cit.*, 1976.

135. J.W. Getzels; E.G. Guba, "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation", *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Volume 29, Number 1, September 1955.

136. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

137. E. Shirk, "The Hidden Curriculum Revisited", *Journal of Thought*, Volume 11, Number 1, January 1976.

138. R. McKeown, "The Teacher's Role: The Fallacies of Academic Freedom and Professional Rights", *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, Volume 60, Number 399, April 1976.

139. Sinks, *Op. cit.*, 1967.

140. Corriveau, *Op. cit.*, 1969.

141. G.S. Johnston; C.C. Yeakey, "Administrators' and Teachers' Preferences for Staff Development", *Planning and Change*, Volume 8, Number 4, Winter 1977.

142. J.C. Smart, "Institutional Goal and Congruence: A Study of Student, Faculty, and Administration Preferences", *Research in Higher Education*, Volume 3, Number 3.

143. V.D. Yuskiewicz; D.J. Willower, "Perceived Pupil Control Ideology Concensus and Teacher Job Satisfaction", *Urban Education*, Volume 8, Number 3, October 1973.

144. C. Burstall, "French in the Primary School: Some Early Findings", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Volume 2, Number 1, May 1970.

145. J.K. Masajan, *College Students' Achievement as a Function of Their Beliefs and Their Instructors' Beliefs*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1972.

146. R.N. Bush, *The Pupil Teacher Relationship*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1954.

147. M.D. Martin, *The Teacher in Cooperative Curriculum Development*, unpublished D.Ed. thesis, University of Southern California, 1965.

148. R. Rosenthal; L. Jacobsen, *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development*, New York, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1968.

149. J.D. Elashoff; R.E. Snow, *Pygmalion Reconsidered*, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing, 1971.

150. D.A. Pidgeon, "A Comparative Study of Basic Attainments", *Educational Research*, Volume 1, Number 1, November 1958.

151. D.A. Pidgeon, *Expectation and Pupil Performance*, Stockholm, Almquist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1970.

152. Burstall, *Op. Cit.*, 1970.

153. S. Kerman, "Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Volume 60, Number 10, June 1979.

154. P. Tamir; E. Jungwirth, "Teaching Objectives in Biology: Priorities and Expectations", *Science Education*, Volume 56, Number 1, January/March 1972.

155. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

156. J.E. Brophy, "Achievement Correlates", in: *Evaluating Educational Performance*, H.J. Walberg (ed.), Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing, 1974.

157. J.E. Brophy; T.L. Good, *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences*, New York, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1974.

158. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

159. T.M. Butler, "Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers", *Clearing House*, Volume 36, Number 1, September 1961.

P.J. Andrisani, *Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience*, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.

160. J.H. Young, "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making: An Organizational Dilemma", *Curriculum Inquiry*, Volume 9, Number 2, Summer 1979.

161. Haller, *Op. Cit.*, 1969.

162. Corwin, *Op. Cit.*, 1965.

163. C. Beecher, "Curriculum Practices: Their Effect and/or Relationship to Selected Biographical and Professional Variables", *Journal of Experimental Education*, Volume 46, Number 2, Winter 1978.

164. R. Lazarowitz, "Does Use of Curriculum Change Teachers' Attitudes Toward Inquiry?" *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Volume 13, Number 6, November 1976.

165. N. Dangharn, *An Investigation of Teacher Innovation and Attitude Toward Participation in Curriculum Planning and Use*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1978.

166. A.A. Oberg, *Information Referents and Patterns in the Curriculum Planning of Classroom Teachers*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.

167. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

168. Butler, *Op. Cit.*, 1961.

169. M.H. Truex, "Factors Critical to College Teaching Success or Failure", *Improving College and University Teaching*, Volume 23, Number 4, Winter 1975.

170. R.L. Politzer; L. Wise, *The Successful Foreign Language Teacher*, Philadelphia, Chilton, 1970.

171. C. Tardif, *Teacher Perceptions of the Cultural Goal in Second Language Teaching*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

172. D. Huenecke, "Knowledge of Curriculum Works: Its Relation to Teaching Practice", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter 1970.

173. D.N. Aspy, "An Investigation into the Relationship Between Teachers' Factual Knowledge of Learning Theory and Their Classroom Performance", *Journal of Teacher Education,* Volume 23, Number 1, Spring 1972.

174. J.E. Reeves, *Information Exchange in Secondary School French Textbook Selection,* unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

175. D. Solomon; W.E. Bezdek; L. Rosenberg, *Teaching Styles and Learning,* Chicago, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963.

176. J.D. Morris, "Personality and Student Teaching Success", *Journal of Experimental Education,* Volume 43, Number 4, Summer 1975.

177. J.G. Houston, "The Effects of Verbal Style in Teaching Physics", *Physics Education,* Volume 10, Number 1, January 1975.

178. H. Smith, "Two Kinds of Teaching", *Journal of Humanistic Psychology,* Volume 15, Number 4, Fall 1975.

179. *Ibid.,* p. 3.

180. P.L. Peterson; R.W. Marx; C.M. Clark, "Teacher Planning, Teacher Planning, Teacher Behavior, and Student Achievement", *American Educational Research Journal,* Volume 15, Number 3, Summer 1978.

181. *Ibid.,* p. 426.

182. P.B. Houshell; D.L. Dieter, "The Self Image of Outstanding Biology Teachers", *School Sciences and Mathematics,* Number 75, March 1975.

183. B.M. Noad, *An Exploration of Relationships Among Self Concept, Educational Attitudes, Motivation, and Reported Competencies of Elementary Student Teachers,* unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Houston, 1978.

184. G.H. Henry, "Style of Teaching and Teacher Evaluation", *English Journal,* Volume 59, Number 7, October 1970.

185. D.F. Walker; J. Shaffarzick, "Comparing Curricula", *Review of Educational Research,* Volume 44, Number 1, Winter 1974.

186. W.H. Nault, "Can Curriculum Guides Be Effective?", *Educational Leadership,* Volume 12, Number 7, April 1955.

187. J.H. Johansen, *An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Authoritative Influence in Local Curriculum Decision-Making and Curriculum Implementation,* unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1965.

188. Definition of functional type as provided by Johansen, *Ibid.,* p. 200.

189. E. Miklos, "Increasing Participation in Decision-Making", *The Canadian Administrator,* Volume 9, Number 6, March 1970.

190. M. Simson; C. Poncelow; J. McLure, "Attitudes Toward Decision-Making in Instructional Development", *Educational Technology*, Volume 16, Number 1, January 1976.

191. A.H. Lamont, *The Effect of Teacher Participation in Preparing Curriculum Materials on Subsequent Use of the Materials*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1964.

192. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. cit.*, 1972.

193. Hoppock, *Op. Cit.*, 1935.

194. Bridges, *Op. Cit.*, 1964.

195. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

196. J.H. Young, *The Curriculum Decision-Making Preferences of Alberta School Personnel*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1977.

197. V.D. Yuskiewicz, *Pupil Control Ideology and Job Satisfaction of Public School Teachers*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

198. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

199. Tardif, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

200. Francoeur, *Op. Cit.*, 1963.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The procedures which were followed in the conduct of this study are presented in this chapter. The choice and the development of the instruments which were used is discussed. The identification of the population and the administration of the questionnaire is described. Finally the statistical treatment of the data is delineated.

A. Instruments

The questionnaire which was employed comprised three sections. The first section elicited personal and demographic information, the second determined curricular influences, and the third measured job satisfaction.

The twenty personal and demographic items were selected from an examination of previous research studies which had shown such factors to be important, and from the literature which had explored their effects upon either job satisfaction or curricular decisions.

The second section of the questionnaire which concerned curricular influences was also drawn from previous research studies and from the relevant literature. These sources yielded over 300 items which were reduced to a final list of sixty-five items. The initial reduction was achieved by eliminating those factors which, in previous studies, had consistently shown no significant relation to job satisfaction or work attitudes. The subsequent reduction was achieved by a classification of items and a combination of similar factors into single items.

The section relating to curricular influences was reviewed and revised three times before being used in an informal pilot study. The first review was made by graduate students in foreign language curriculum at the University of Alberta. A second review was made by the writer's thesis director at the Université Laval. The third and final review was made in conjunction with a statistician at the Université Laval. These three reviews led to changes in the questionnaire which clarified meaning and wording, ensured uni-directional responses, and eliminated "leading" questions.

The final items relating to curricular influences were arranged in random order using a Table of Random Numbers[1] to avoid a clustering of the areas or the levels of curricular influences.

The questionnaire which emerged from the above examinations, included in Appendix A, was printed and utilized in an informal pilot study. Nine copies were distributed by Wayne Moss, Southern Alberta Regional Consultant for Second Languages, to a provincial curriculum committee on second language curriculum. Five copies were distributed to a graduate class in foreign language curriculum and instruction at the University of Calgary.

Subsequent meetings with Mr. Moss and with Dr. Paquet's graduate class resulted in twelve changes in the questionnaire. Of these, four were technical changes in presentation, five were changes involving clarification, two were changes in emphasis, and one addition which would allow a free response to discover non-specified curricular influences.

The appearance of repetition within the questionnaire was raised in the pilot study by some respondents. The actual questions concerned such differences as freedom in methods and freedom in materials, and desire for greater participation at the school level and at the provincial level. Order respondents did indeed distinguish between such differences and some even desired that further distinctions be made. The questions were retained as disparate items. In the cover letter accompanying the principal mailing, included in Appendix B, a special request was made asking the respondents to answer all questions despite any seeming repetition of items.

No calculations of reliability or validity were made because of the informality of the pilot study, the primary concern with comments regarding the reception of the questionnaire, and a time factor which precluded the double testing required for such calculations.

The third section of the questionnaire was intended to determine the respondents' levels of job satisfaction. The primary tool was the Brayfield-Rothe *Index of Job Satisfaction*[2]. Brayfield and Rothe constructed their index with the assumption that job satisfaction could be inferred from the individual's attitude to his work. Their attitude scale was designed to meet the following requirements:

1. It should be given an index to "overall" job satisfaction rather than to specific aspects of the job situation.
2. It should be applicable to a wide variety of jobs.
3. It should be sensitive to variations in attitudes.
4. The items should be of such a nature (interesting, realistic, and varied) that the scale would evoke cooperation from both management and employees.
5. It should yield a reliable index.
6. It should yield a valid index.
7. It should be brief and easily scored[3].

Using the Thurstone method an original 1,079 items were obtained, analysed, sorted, and edited resulting in a preliminary eighteen-item scale. After piloting and revising, a second scale of eighteen items was derived with values ranging from 1.2 to 10.0 on the Thurstone scale with approximate 0.5 step intervals. The Thurstone scale value indicated the direction for scoring the items. The items were not arranged in order of magnitude of scale values. Five categories of response according to agreement or disagreement were provided for each item which could then be scored by weighted values ranging from one to five. Thus, items at the satisfied end of the scale were rated five points for "strongly agree", four points for

"agree", three points for "undecided", two points for "disagree", and one point for "strongly disagree". Similarly, items at the dissatisfied end of the scale were rated five points for "strongly disagree", four points for "disagree", three points for "undecided", two points for "agree" and one point for "strongly agree". Consequently, a low score total represented dissatisfaction while a high score total represented satisfaction of the respondents with their jobs, the range of scores being from eighteen to ninety with a neutral or undecided point at fifty-four[4].

The final scale was administered to 231 subjects yielding a range of thirty-five - eighty-seven, a mean of 63.8 and a standard deviation of 9.4. The odd-even product moment reliability coefficients for these subjects was 0.77 which was corrected to 0.87 by the Spearman-Brown formula[5].

The validity of the scale was determined using a group of ninety-one adult night school students which was divided into two groups. One group was employed in occupations appropriate to their interests and therefore assumed to be more satisfied. The second group was employed in occupations inappropriate to their interests and was assumed to be less satisfied. This sample yielded a range of scores from twenty-nine - eighty-nine with a mean of 70.4 and a standard deviation of 13.2, but with significant differences of mean scores for the two groups. Application of Fisher and Behrens' test for differences of means and variances proved to be significant, thus showing the validity of the index in distinguishing levels of job satisfaction[6].

A second method of validating the Index of Job Satisfaction consisted of administering the Hoppock[7] Job Satisfaction Blank to the same adult students who had completed the Brayfield-Rothe Index, and comparing the results. The product-moment correlation between scores on the two forms was 0.92[8].

In addition to the Brayfield-Rothe Index, two further questions relevant to job satisfaction were included. The intention of these additions was to allow a comparison with other studies using such measures, and to provide a check on the Brayfield-Rothe Index. The first supplemental question was a single, overall self-rating item regarding global job satisfaction, similar to that used by Holdaway[9] but employing a five-point rather than a seven-point response scale. The second was a behavioral item regarding the respondent's intention to remain in teaching despite monetary inducements to leave, as employed by Lacy,[10] and as suggested by Belasco and Alutto[11].

The final questionnaire comprising all three parts is included in Appendix C.

B. Population

The names of modern language teachers were obtained from the Alberta Department of Education with the assistance of Dr. P. Lamoureux and Mr. O. Klaus. The list employed was based on the information recorded on "Form A"

cards which are completed by all teachers of the province in public, separate, and private schools at the beginning of each academic year. The "Form A" card includes a question asking respondents to indicate those subject areas in which they are engaged for one-third or more of their instruction time.

It should be noted that use of this list precluded reaching a certain number of elementary teachers who are involved in modern language instruction but who consider themselves primarily classroom teachers (for example, grade one or grade two teachers) and whose instruction time did not meet the one-third criterion. The list also contained some duplication of names caused by teachers who listed themselves separately for German and French, or any two modern languages. An effort was made to reduce such duplication but since the original list was not in alphabetic order, some cases still remained as was shown in the returns.

The final list comprised 763 names which represented the population of the study.

C. Administration of the Questionnaire

As indicated above, the three instruments were compiled into a single questionnaire. This questionnaire comprised twelve pages. Copies of the questionnaire were placed into pre-addressed return envelopes with sufficient postage for first-class handling. These envelopes, together with copies of the cover letter were in turn inserted into envelopes for first-class mailing.

The cover letter indicating the purposes of the study also assured the respondents of the confidentiality of their replies and asked for complete responses despite some seemingly repetitious items. A copy of the cover letter is included in Appendix B. The title page of the questionnaire clearly indicated the limitation of the study to teachers of modern languages "engaged in such instruction for one-third or more of their teaching time".

The questionnaires were mailed on March 12 and 13, 1980, and a cut-off date of April 12, 1980 was established. By this date 422 returns had been received, representing a 55.3 percent rate of return. Of the returns, 365 questionnaires were usable and fifty-seven were non-usable.

The high rate of non-usable questionnaires was largely attributable to replies from teachers who did not meet the "one-third time" requirement, teachers who were not second language instructors, including teachers of French as a first language, and teachers who did not complete parts of the questionnaires essential for statistical analysis (namely pages one, two, eleven, or twelve). Table I summarizes the distribution of questionnaires and a breakdown of returns.

D. Statistical Treatment of Data

All possible responses to items of the questionnaire were coded, as indicated in Appendix D, and all the responses for all questionnaires were punched onto IBM cards.

Statistical treatments were made employing the IBM-370/158 computer at the "Centre du traitement de l'information" of the Université Laval. The following treatments were performed on the data:

1. Questions one to eighteen, inclusive, of Part Three of the questionnaire were added to provide a Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Score for each subject. This score was punched as an addition to the original data for use in subsequent analyses.
2. The program P2D developed by L. Engelman for use with the BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs (P-series, 1977)[12] was used to obtain a detailed data description including frequencies, means, medians, modes, maximum and minimum scores, ranges, and standard deviations.
3. The program P1V developed by L. Engelman and K. Yamasaki was used to obtain an analysis of variance between ordered variables.
4. The program P2V developed by R. Jennrich and P. Samson was used to obtain an analysis of variance between unordered variables and the job satisfaction score.
5. The program P8D developed by P. Mundle was used to obtain coefficients of correlation between all variables.
6. The program P4M developed by J. Frane and R. Jennrich was used to perform a factor analysis of correlation with the sixty-five curricular influence variables.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURNS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Category	Number	Percent of Original Distribution	Percent of Returns Received
Questionnaires distributed	763	--	--
Questionnaires returned	422	55.3	--
Returns:			
Usable	365	47.8	86.5
Non-usable	57	7.4	13.5
Non-usable returns:			
Not "one-third or more"	23	3.0	5.5
Not "second language"	13	1.7	3.1
Incompleted page(s)	11	1.4	2.6
Too long or other criticisms	3	0.4	0.7
No longer teaching	2	0.3	0.5
Duplicate received	2	0.3	0.5
No reason given	3	0.4	0.7

NOTES

1. M.G. Kendall; B.B. Smith, "Randomness and Random Sampling Numbers", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society,* Number 101, 1938.

2. A.M. Brayfield; H.F. Rothe, "An Index of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Volume 35, Number 5, October 1951.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 308.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 310.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 310-311.

7. R. Hoppock, *Job Satisfaction,* New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935.

8. Brayfield; Rothe, *Op. Cit.*, p. 311.

9. E.A. Holdaway, *Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report,* Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1978, p. 172.

10. A. Lacy, *An Analysis of Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Education Teachers in Ohio,* unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University, 1968, pp. 62, 242.

11. J.A. Belasco; J.A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly,* Volume 8, Number 1, Winter 1972.

12. M.B. Brown (edition editor); W.J. Dixon (series editor), *BMDP Biomedical Computer Programs, P-Series,* Los Angeles Health Sciences Computing Facility, University of California, 1977.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

A. Characteristics of Respondents

A description is provided of the characteristics of the 365 teachers whose questionnaires were useable. A summary of the response frequencies for the personal and demographic variables may be found in Table II.

1. Sex: Of the sample, 141 or 38.6 percent were male and 224 or 61.4 percent were female.

2. Marital status: The majority of the sample was married with 256 or 70.1 percent indicating this category. Of the remainder, eighty-seven or 23.8 percent were single and twenty-two or six percent were separated, divorced, or widowed.

3. Age: Twenty-nine subjects or 7.9 percent were under twenty-five years old. 107 or 29.3 percent were twenty-five to twenty-nine, eighty-nine or 24.4 percent were thirty to thirty-four, thirty-nine or 10.7 percent were thirty-five to thirty-nine, forty-one or 11.2 percent were forty to forty-four, twenty-three or 6.3 percent were forty-five to forty-nine, twenty or 5.5 percent were fifty to fifty-four, thirteen or 3.6 percent were fifty-five to fifty-nine, and four or 1.1 percent were over sixty years of age.

4. Highest level of education attained: Respondents most frequently reported holding a Bachelor of Education degree with 148 subjects or 40.5 percent indicating this response. Another bachelor's degree and a teaching diploma was reported by 102 subjects or 27.9 percent. Two bachelor's degrees were held by fifty-nine subjects or 16.2 percent. Forty-four respondents or 12.1 percent declared a master's degree and two or 0.5 percent declared a doctorate. Only ten respondents or 2.7 percent claimed to have three years or less of university training.

5. Preparation: Two-thirds or 66.6 percent of the sample declared having majored in foreign languages. Of these, 179 or forty-nine percent took their training within the field of education while sixty-four or 17.5 percent took their training outside the field of education. A high 31.8 percent reported no major in foreign languages either within or outside the field of education. Of this latter group, seventy-six or 20.8 percent had another major in the field of education while forty or eleven percent had another major outside the field of education. This item elicited five non-responses.

6. Teaching experience: Just over one-quarter of the sample or 27.9 percent were in their first four years of teaching. Another thirty-one percent had five to nine years experience. 18.1 percent had ten to

TABLE II

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES FOR PERSONAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variable	Number	Percent
1. Sex:		
(a) Male	141	38.6
(b) Female	224	61.4
2. Marital status:		
(a) Single	87	23.8
(b) Married	256	70.1
(c) Widow(er)	1	0.3
(d) Separated or divorced	21	5.8
3. Age:		
(a) 20 - 24	29	7.9
(b) 25 - 29	107	29.3
(c) 30 - 34	89	24.4
(d) 35 - 39	39	10.7
(e) 40 - 44	41	11.2
(f) 45 - 49	23	6.3
(g) 50 - 54	20	5.5
(h) 55 - 59	13	3.6
(i) 60 or over	4	1.1
4. Highest level of education attained:		
(a) Three years of university or less	10	2.7
(b) Bachelor of Education degree	148	40.5
(c) Bachelor's degree and a teaching diploma	102	27.9
(d) Two bachelor's degrees	59	16.2
(e) Master's degree	44	12.1
(f) Doctorate	2	0.5
5. Preparation:		
(a) Major in foreign language(s) within the field of education	179	49.0
(b) Major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education	64	17.5
(c) Non-major in foreign language(s) within the field of education	76	20.8
(d) Non-major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education	40	11.0
(-) No response	5	1.4

Cont'd...

TABLE II (Cont'd)

Variable	Number	Percent
6. Total years of teaching experience:		
(a) 0 - 4	102	27.9
(b) 5 - 9	113	31.0
(c) 10 - 14	66	18.1
(d) 15 - 19	28	7.7
(e) 20 - 24	30	8.2
(f) 25 or more	25	6.8
(-) No response	1	0.3
7. Number of years of teaching in present school:		
(a) 0 - 4	212	58.1
(b) 5 - 9	84	23.0
(c) 10 - 14	45	12.3
(d) 15 - 19	13	3.6
(e) 20 - 24	8	2.2
(f) 25 or more	2	0.5
(-) No response	1	0.3
8. Present teaching level:		
(a) Elementary	2	0.5
(b) Junior high	119	32.6
(c) Senior high	124	34.0
(d) Elementary - Junior high	40	11.0
(e) Junior - Senior high	72	19.7
(f) Elementary - Junior - Senior high	8	2.2
9. Other than as a classroom teacher, do you hold administrative position:		
(a) No	308	84.4
(b) Yes, as a department head	32	8.8
(c) Yes, as a vice-principal or an assistant principal	18	4.9
(d) Yes, as a principal	7	1.9
10. Foreign language(s) taught:		
(a) French	307	84.1
(b) German	20	5.5
(c) Ukrainian	14	3.8
(d) Other	1	0.3
(e) Combination of the above	23	6.3
11. Indicate the main program you are using:		
(a) "Voix et Images" only	16	4.4
(b) "Ecouter et Parler" only	7	1.9
(c) "Le Français International (LFI)" only	121	33.2

Cont'd...

TABLE II (Cont'd)

Variable	Number	Percent
(d) "J'ecoute, je parle" only	16	4.4
(e) "Passeport Français" only	6	1.6
(f) Combination of methods inlcuding LFI	60	16.4
(g) Combination of methods not including LFI	29	7.9
(h) Other French program	55	15.1
(i) German, Ukrainian, or methods for combination of languages	42	11.5
(-) No response	13	3.6
12. Other than foreign languages, how many subjects do you teach:		
(a) None	101	27.7
(b) One	126	34.5
(c) Two	63	17.3
(d) Three	42	11.5
(e) Four or more	33	9.0
13. Size of school population:		
(a) Less than 200	35	9.6
(b) 200 - 399	114	31.2
(c) 400 - 599	105	28.8
(d) 600 - 1,000	59	16.2
(e) Over 1,000	48	13.2
(-) No response	4	1.1
14. Number of colleagues teaching foreign languages in your school:		
(a) None	120	32.9
(b) One	81	22.2
(c) Two	39	10.7
(d) Three	26	7.1
(e) Four or more	33	9.0
(-) No response	66	18.1
15. Size of community in which you teach:		
(a) Less than 5,000	150	41.1
(b) 5,000 - 10,000	34	9.3
(c) 10,000 - 25,000	18	4.9
(d) 25,000 - 50,000	35	9.6
(e) 50,000 - 100,000	7	1.9
(f) Over 100,000	116	31.8
(-) No response	5	1.4

Cont'd...

TABLE II (Cont'd)

Variable	Number	Percent
16. Average number of students in each of your foreign language classes:		
(a) Less than 15	45	12.3
(b) 15 - 19	84	23.0
(c) 20 - 24	131	35.9
(d) 25 - 29	78	21.4
(e) 30 - 34	25	6.8
(f) 35 or more	1	0.3
(-) No response	1	0.3
17. Professional organization affiliation:		
(a) Alberta Modern Language Council (MLC) only	100	27.4
(b) Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) only	1	0.3
(c) L'Association Canadienne - Française de l'Alberta only	17	4.7
(d) L'Alliance Française only	1	0.3
(e) German, Ukrainian, or other ethnic organization only	15	4.1
(f) MLC and CASLT	8	2.2
(g) Two of (c), (d), and (e)	0	0.0
(h) MLC or CASLT and one of (c), (d), or (e)	28	7.7
(i) Three or more organizations	7	1.9
(-) No response	188	51.5
18. Are your foreign language classes semestered:		
(a) Yes	125	34.2
(b) No	206	56.4
(c) Some	31	8.5
(-) No response	3	0.8
19. Is the foreign language which you teach your mother tongue:		
(a) Yes	102	27.9
(b) No	260	71.2
(-) No response	3	0.8
20. Have you served on any committees or had other input into the present provincial curriculum:		
(a) Yes	75	20.5
(b) No	287	78.6
(-) No response	3	0.8

fourteen years, 7.7 percent had fifteen to nineteen years, 8.2 percent had twenty to twenty-four years, and 6.8 percent had twenty-five or more years of experience.

7. Years in present school: Over half of the sample, or 58.1 percent reported being in their present school for four years or less. Almost another quarter or twenty-three percent reported five to nine years in their present school. 12.3 percent had served ten to fourteen years, 3.6 percent had served fifteen to nineteen years, 2.2 percent had served twenty to twenty-four years, and 0.5 percent had served for twenty-five or more years in their current schools.

8. Teaching level: As anticipated with the use of the mailing list derived from Alberta Education "Form A" cards, a very low number of respondents worked primarily at the elementary level. Only two subjects or 0.5 percent gave this response. Almost equal amounts of junior high and senior high teachers appeared in the sample with respective numbers of 119 and 124 and respective percentages of 32.6 and thirty-four. A further forty subjects or eleven percent worked at both elementary and junior high levels, while seventy-two or 19.7 percent worked at both junior and senior high levels, and a final eight subjects or 2.2 percent worked at all three levels.

9. Administrative duties: A large 84.4 percent of the sample reported no other administrative duties additional to those of a classroom teacher. Of the remainder, thirty-two or 8.8 percent were department heads, eighteen or 4.9 percent were associate or vice-principals, and seven or 1.9 percent were principals.

10. Foreign language(s) taught: The greatest number of respondents were teachers of French with 307 subjects or eighty-four percent indicating this area. Twenty respondents or 5.5 percent were primarily teachers of German, fourteen respondents or 3.8 percent were primarily teachers of Ukrainian, and one teacher indicated the area "other", specifying it to be Spanish. The remaining twenty-three respondents or 6.3 percent taught a combination of languages.

11. Program: Of the French programs being used in Alberta, "Le Français International" was most common with 121 users representing 33.2 percent of the total sample. A further sixty respondents or 16.4 percent reported using "Le Français International" and another program. The next most commonly used programs were "Voix et Images de France" and "J'écoute; je parle", with sixteen users or 4.4 percent each. Other programs such as "Ecouter et parler", "Passeport Français", "Voix et visages", "Ici on parle français", "French for Mastery"; others trailed with less than two percent each. Of the respondents teaching French, twenty-nine or 7.9 percent reported using a combination of methods not including "Le Français International".

No specific analysis of programs in German and Ukrainian was undertaken because of the extremely small numbers. Nonetheless, the scorers of

the questionnaires noted a proportionately large number of these respondents indicating the use of self-developed programs.

12. Number of other subjects taught: Approximately one-quarter of the sample or 27.7 percent reported teaching only modern languages. Fully an additional third or 34.5 percent reported only one other assignment, 17.3 percent reported teaching two additional subjects, 11.5 percent reported teaching three additional subjects, and nine percent reported teaching in four or more additional areas.

13. School size: Thirty-five respondents or 9.6 percent indicated that their school's enrollment was less than 200 students, 114 teachers or 31.2 percent indicated enrollments of 200 - 399, 105 teachers or 28.8 percent indicated enrollments of 400 - 599, fifty-nine teachers or 16.2 percent reported enrollments of 600 - 1,000, and forty-eight teachers or 13.2 percent reported their schools' enrollment to be over 1,000 students.

14. Number of colleagues teaching modern languages: Because of an omission in typing, this item elicited a very high number of answers (sixty-six) which were classed as non-responses. Of the remainder, 120 or 32.9 percent indicated that they were the only modern language teacher in the school. Eighty-one teachers or 22.2 percent had one other colleague teaching modern languages, thirty-nine teachers or 10.7 percent had two colleagues in modern languages, twenty-six or 7.1 percent had three colleagues in modern languages, and thirty-three or nine percent had four or more colleagues in modern languages.

15. Community size: The large majority of modern language teachers worked in communities of less than 5,000 or over 100,000 inhabitants. 150 respondents or 41.1 percent reported a population of less than 5,000, while 116 or 31.8 percent reported a population of over 100,000 for their communities. The remaining quarter had 9.3 percent teaching in communities of 5,000 - 10,000, 4.9 percent teaching in communities of 10,001 - 25,000, 9.6 percent teaching in communities of 25,001 - 50,000 and 1.9 percent teaching in communities of 50,001 - 100,000.

16. Class size: The most common average class size was twenty to twenty-four students reported by 131 subjects or 35.9 percent. Forty-five or 12.3 percent reported average classes of less than fifteen students, eighty-four or twenty-three percent reported fifteen to nineteen students as average, seventy-eight or 21.4 percent reported twenty-five to twenty-nine students as average, twenty-five or 6.8 percent reported thirty to thirty-four students as average, and only one or 0.3 percent reported average class size as thirty-five or more.

17. Professional organization affiliation: Just over half of the sample reported no affiliation with selected professional organizations, with 181 subjects or 51.5 percent indicating this. Over one-quarter indicated belonging solely to the Alberta Modern Language Council (MLC) with 100 or 27.4 percent of such responses. Unique membership in the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) was reported by

only one teacher; eight teachers or 2.2 percent belonged to both the MLC and CASLT. Eighteen teachers or 4.9 percent reported membership in l'Association Canadienne-Française de l'Alberta or l'Alliance Française, while fifteen or 4.1 percent reported membership in German, Ukrainian, or other ethnic organizations. Twenty-eight teachers or 7.7 percept reported membership in both a modern language and an ethnic organization and seven teachers or 1.9 percent indicated holding memberships in three or more organizations.

18. Semestering: A majority represented by 206 respondents or 56.4 percent declared that their modern language classes were not semestered. Over one-third declared their classes to be semestered with 125 or 34.2 percent such responses. Thirty-one teachers or 8.5 percent taught a mixture of semestered and non-semestered courses.

19. Teaching mother tongue: Just over one-quarter of the sample or 27.9 percent indicated that the modern language being taught was their mother tongue. 71.2 percent indicated they were not teaching their mother tongue.

20. Input into present curriculum: Approximately one-fifth of the respondents declared having either served on a committee or having had some other input into the present curriculum as was revealed by seventy or 20.5 percent such responses. The remaining 287 or 78.6 percent declared not having given any such input.

B. Measures of Job Satisfaction

A description is provided for the three measures of job satisfaction which were utilized and an examination of their correlation is presented. The detailed response frequencies for the job satisfaction measures may be found in Talbe III and IV.

1. Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction scores: All 365 questionnaires comprising the sample yielded a Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction score. Out of the possible total score of ninety, the range of this sample was thirty to eighty-nine with a mean score of 67.48 and a standard deviation of 9.65.

2. Self-rated overall level of job satisfaction: Of the 365 respondents making up the sample only one non-response was elicited. Of the remainder a large majority of 83.6 percent reported being satisfied with their job. Of these, ninety-nine subjects or 27.1 percent indicated the term "very satisfied" while 206 subjects or 56.4 percent indicated the simple term "satisfied". A further twenty-six or 7.1 percent declared themselves to be "undecided", thirty-two subjects or 8.8 percent were "dissatisfied" and only one subject or 0.3 percent was "very dissatisfied".

These results compare very favorably to results obtained by Holdaway[1] on a similar question. While using a seven-point scale, the combined satisfaction scores represented 83.7 percent as compared to the 83.6 percent of this study. Less comparable was Holdaway's "neutral" category which

TABLE III

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES OF BRAYFIELD-ROTHE
JOB SATISFACTION INDEX VALUES

Value	Number	Percent	Value	Number	Percent
30	1	0.3	66	23	6.3
35	3	0.8	67	20	5.5
37	1	0.3	68	21	5.8
42	1	0.3	69	18	4.9
44	3	0.8	70	21	5.8
45	1	0.3	71	8	2.2
46	1	0.3	72	17	4.7
47	5	1.4	73	13	3.6
48	2	0.5	74	11	3.0
50	2	0.5	75	12	3.3
51	5	1.4	76	10	2.7
52	4	1.1	77	9	2.5
53	2	0.5	78	4	1.1
55	2	0.5	79	6	1.6
56	4	1.1	80	5	1.4
57	5	1.4	81	9	2.5
58	6	1.6	82	6	1.6
59	6	1.6	83	4	1.1
60	11	3.0	84	2	0.5
61	8	2.2	85	4	1.1
62	14	3.8	86	3	0.8
63	18	4.9	87	2	0.5
64	15	4.1	88	1	0.3
65	14	3.8	89	2	0.5

TABLE IV

RESPONSE FREQUENCIES OF OTHER
JOB SATISFACTION MEASURES

	Variable	Number	Percent
19.	What is your overall level of satisfaction with your job?		
	(a) Very satisfied	99	27.1
	(b) Satisfied	206	56.4
	(c) Undecided	26	7.1
	(d) Dissatisfied	32	8.8
	(e) Very dissatisfied	1	0.3
	(-) No response	1	0.3
20.	How do you feel about changing your job?		
	(a) I do not want to change jobs, even for more money, as this is a good one.	126	34.5
	(b) This job is as good as the average. I would just as soon have it as another.	105	28.8
	(c) I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do.	17	4.7
	(d) I am not eager to change jobs, but would do so if I could make more money.	60	16.4
	(e) I would take almost any other job (either teaching or non-teaching) in which I could earn as much as I am now earning.	22	6.0
	(-) No response	14	3.8
	(+) Other reason indicated by respondent	21	5.8

elicited only two percent of his sample's responses as compared to this study's 7.1 percent who responded with "undecided". Also, Holdaway's combined dissatisfaction score represented almost fifteen percent of his sample as compared to the 9.1 percent of this study.

3. Desire for job change and monetary incentive: As a behavioral definition of job satisfaction, willingness to change jobs was used. Five levels of incentives, borrowed from Lacy,[2] weighted on a scale of one to five were employed. Seventeen subjects or 4.7 percent showed extreme dissatisfaction by indicating they "would quit this job at once if (they) had anything else to do". A further twenty-two subjects or six percent showed some dissatisfaction by indicating they "would take almost any other job, either teaching or non-teaching in which (they) could earn as much as (they were) now earning". Sixty subjects or 16.4 percent indicated that they were "not eager to change jobs, but would do so if (they) could make more money". 105 subjects or 28.8 percent considered their present job "as good as the average (and) would just as soon have it as another". A high 126 subjects or 34.5 percent showed extreme satisfaction by indicating they did "not want to change jobs even for more money as (their present position was) a good one".

Some respondents disliked the use of a monetary incentive and indicated alternative incentives which might induce them to change jobs. Nine subjects or 2.5 percent named other factors which could be related to job satisfaction. Another twelve or 3.3 percent named factors not directly related to job conditions, and fourteen or 3.8 percent did not reply.

4. Job satisfaction measure correlations: Coefficients of correlation were calculated between pairs of the three measures of job satisfaction which had been employed in the questionnaire. In the case of the behavioral question based on a monetary incentive the thirty-five questionnaires which contained other factors or no reply were omitted from the calculation.

The coefficient of correlation between the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction score and the self-rated overall job satisfaction score was 0.7850.

The coefficient of correlation between the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction score and the scored behavioral question was 0.6846.

The coefficient of correlation between the self-rated overall job satisfaction score and the scored behavioral question was 0.6147.

All three coefficients of correlation were highly significant at a level of 0.005. In consideration of these results, the Brayfield-Rothe satisfaction scores were exclusively used in further analyses of the data with justification and confidence.

C. Description of Curricular Influences

The sixty-five curricular influences included in Part II of the questionnaire each had five possible responses, namely "strongly disagree",

"disagree", "undecided or neutral", "agree", and "strongly agree". These responses were weighted on a scale of one to five if the item was expected to correlate positively with satisfaction and on a scale of five to one if the item was expected to correlate inversely with satisfaction. Thus reversal allowed low scores and high scores to be consistently interpreted as disagreement or agreement with the statements as they were expected to correlate with satisfaction.

1. Highest mean score items: The means of the weighted scores for all 365 respondents were calculated and a summary of the fifteen highest is presented in Table V.

The table reveals that the respondents largely agree that they have freedom in matters concerning the organization and sequencing of class content, the introduction of personal innovations, the use of a combination of methods or texts, the use of one's normal teaching style, the selection of methods, and the selection of subject matter. High mean agreement scores also revealed a generally positive view regarding student feedback as a guide to program or method revision, regarding the teacher's own ability to select and adapt curricula for classroom use, and regarding the value of out-of-school experiences and professional organizations and publications. The mean scores also showed high satisfaction with teachers' grade and subject assignments and their respect for colleagues and administration. Finally, the fifteen highest means showed that the respondents largely desire to take further training in the language which they teach and in curriculum and methodology.

The percentage of respondents replying "strongly agree" or "agree" (as weighted) were combined for each item in Part II to obtain a general satisfaction score. These scores were placed in a rank order and it was found that the thirteen top scores had already been included in the list of highest mean agreement scores. The rank order of this second listing is included in Table V.

2. Lowest mean score items: The means of the weighted scores for all 365 respondents were calculated and a summary of the fifteen lowest is presented in Table VI.

The list of items with lowest mean scores disclosed high disagreement regarding the adequacy of preparation time, amount of contact with other foreign language professionals, in-service programs offered, existing systems for the review and revision of programs, and the adequacy of university methods courses. Generally low scores also showed the importance of such factors as class size, the range of student abilities, the amount of clerical work, the role of politics in the development and implementation of programs. Respondents indicated disagreement regarding the meaningfulness and fairness of external examination, the facility of arranging for native speakers, and their communities' valuing of foreign language programs. They also disagreed that a satisfactory amount of participation was being granted them in curriculum development at the system level, and that the amount of change in curriculum, generally, was adequate. The lowest mean

TABLE V

MEANS FOR FIFTEEN ITEMS HAVING THE HIGHEST MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES AND RANK ORDER SATISFACTION SCORES

Item	Mean Score	Rank Order of "Satisfied" Response
29. Freedom to organize and sequence the detailed content of classes	4.16438	(1)
34. Possibility for individual teacher innovations	4.00822	(7)
4. Freedom to use a combination of methods, texts	4.00274	(8)
17. Student feedback considered helpful in revising teaching methods and programs	3.99178	(3)
38. Colleagues and administration respect teacher's competence as a foreign language teacher	3.97260	(4)
33. Out-of-school experiences deemed valuable in program preparation	3.94794	(12)
12. Have ability to select and adapt curriculum	3.92603	(5)
63. Desire to take additional language training	3.92329	(11)
46. Freedom to use one's normal teaching style	3.90411	(2)
44. Satisfaction with grade level(s) assignment	3.89589	(9)
18. Would not prefer assignment in another subject area	3.87671	(-)
36. Freedom to select teaching methods	3.86027	(6)
10. Professional organizations and publications deemed beneficial	3.83288	(13)
23. Desire to take additional curriculum and methodology courses	3.79999	(-)
28. Freedom to select subject matter for classes	3.79726	(10)

TABLE VI

MEANS FOR FIFTEEN ITEMS HAVING THE LOWEST MEAN AGREEMENT SCORES AND RANK ORDER DISSATISFACTION SCORES

	Item	Mean Score	Rank Order of "Dissatisfied" Response
49.	Situational and cultural differences do not affect achievement of European standards	1.85295	(1)
54.	Adequate preparation time in school day	2.20822	(2)
60.	Class size poses no problems in program preparation and implementation	2.50411	(4)
32.	Sufficient contact with other foreign language professions: teachers, curriculum workers	2.57534	(3)
52.	Range of student abilities poses few planning problems	2.63836	(6)
7.	External examinations are well-constructed, meaningful, and fair	2.66849	(-)
41.	Adequate in-service programs are conducted	2.69589	(5)
64.	Satisfaction with on-going review and revision of program in school systems	2.70959	(13)
35.	Little difficulty in arranging participation of native speakers in program	2.71781	(7)
45.	Politics have not affected the development of foreign language programs	2.73151	(11)
59.	Community values foreign language(s)	2.76986	(14)
47.	University curriculum and methodology courses provided adequate preparation to teaching	2.77808	(12)
6.	Preparation, correction, and clerical duties do not hinder effective teaching of program	2.81918	(8)
53.	Satisfactory amount of participation in the school system's curriculum development	2.821917	(-)
65.	Satisfactory amount of change in the foreign language curriculum	2.83562	(-)

score, however, resulted from strong disagreement concerning the possibility of achieving European language standards in light of situational and cultural differences.

The percentage of respondents replying "strongly disagree" or "disagree" (as weighted) were combined for each item in Part II to obtain a general dissatisfaction score. These scores were placed in a rank order and it was found that twelve of the top fifteen items had already been included in the list of lowest mean agreement scores. The rank scores of this second listing are included in Table VI. The three additional items included in this listing related to disagreement regarding the provision of support personnel (Item 22), the availability of sufficient supplemental resources (Item 62), and consideration of foreign languages as important by colleagues and the administration (Item 55).

D. Description of Comments

Following the sixty-five items on specific curricular influences, an open-ended question asked for comments concerning any further aspects of curriculum which affect job satisfaction. Seventy-seven respondents provided comments, the majority of these reiterating or expanding items which had been raised in the questionnaire.

The most frequent comment related to the problem of community values. As one representative teacher stated, "I find the most important factor working against the success of the program is the attitude of students and parents". Another specified, "There is an anti-French attitude in this province which we must face". And another added, "(even) many staff members are visibly racist, anti-French".

A second area of concern was that of time. Several comments indicated schools which do not follow the provincially recommended time allotment but which still expect the achievement of the full-program goals. This laxness appears especially at introductory levels and creates subsequent problems of program articulation, another area of concern. One teacher explained, "In elementary grades, students needing special help (in core subjects) do not take French. In junior high all students take French and the 'special education students' pose a real problem in a class where the majority have had three years of French". Others commented on the time limitations of a three-year program. And the division of time in semestered systems created difficulties in planning. As one teacher explained, "I usually have classes I haven't seen for at least half a year, if not for a full year, (and) I spend my first three to five weeks just in review, when precious time needed to cover new material is wasted".

A third concern was that of supplemental materials. Some comments dealt with the difficulty of finding appropriate materials, others dealt with the difficulty of finding time to locate and adapt such materials, and yet others dealt with the problem of funding such purchases.

Another concern related to lack of supervision with the result that, "there is no one to advise me". And some small system teachers added the factor of isolation, noting, as one teacher did, "Being a one-man department ...deprives me of reliable feedback concerning my own competence. Isolation in a one-school system is a negative factor".

External exams evoked some comments expressing the opinion that they "will change the emphasis from aural/oral to a write/read approach" since "the Department's exam contains no oral component". Others felt gouvernmental influence in their work because of such items as standards: "the minimum of a forty percent passing standard is inadequate for promotion to the next grade. It should be at least sixty percent in foreign languages", and guidance: "there is a lack of consensus as to what emphasis should be placed on aural, oral, reading, and writing skills".

Four teachers commented to the effect, "I am teaching French because I happen to be French. I do not enjoy it". Others commented on the problem of student attitude and motivation with regard to both school in general and modern languages in particular. Two comments were made on the difficulty of non-native speakers in maintaining their own fluency.

Further comments covered a wide range of factors. Most of these related to individual cases or expressed individual opinions. No further major factors affecting job satisfaction could be discerned from the comments.

E. Analysis for Variance and Co-Variance for Personal and Demographic Variables with Job Satisfaction

The program "BMDP1V - one-way analysis of variance and co-variance" was used to determine whether any linear, quadratic, or cubic correlations existed between the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction scores and the various ordered personal and demographic variables.

1. Sex: The mean satisfaction score for males was 66.2, while that for females was 68.3. This difference showing females to be more satisfied was significant at a level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

This finding which revealed female teachers to be more satisfied than male teachers contradicted that of Hadaway[3] who found differences between females and males to be insignificant. However, this study's finding confirmed those of several other studies, including Chase[4], Karolat[5], Belasco and Alutto[6], Hennessy[7], and Holdaway[8].

2. Marital Status: The mean satisfaction score for married respondents was 67.6, while that for single respondents was 67.5. Separated or divorced respondents had a mean of 65.4 and the one widowed respondent had a score of sixty-three. None of these differences were statistically significant.

The lack of significant differences between groups of different marital status contradicted the findings of some others such as those of Butler[9] and Chase[10]. Butler, however, pointed out that the greater dissatisfaction of his married respondents could have been related to inadequate salaries especially since his study was limited to first-year teachers at the bottom of the pay scale. Chase similarly emphasized that one of the major factors of his 1951 study was the adequacy of salary as a determinant of job satisfaction. Other studies such as that of McClusky and Strayer[11] reported findings showing no significant differences in job satisfaction for groups of different marital status.

3. Age: The nine age groups used were twenty to twenty-four years, twenty-five to twenty-nine years, thirty to thirty-four years, thirty-five to thirty-nine years, forty to forty-four years, forty-five to forty-nine years, fifty to fifty-four years, fifty-five to fifty-nine years, and sixty years or more. The respective mean satisfaction scores for these groups were 69.1, 67.3, 66.6, 64.8, 67.3, 68.6, 72.5, 68.1, and 75.8. The difference between the group means was not statistically significant. The decrease in mean satisfaction between the ages of twenty and thirty-nine and the general increase thereafter, produced a linear relationship which was significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level.

These results appeared to confirm those of other researchers. Karolat[12], Belasco and Alutto[13], and Hadaway[14], all found older respondents to score higher on satisfaction scales. Holdaway's[15] study showed a trend almost identical to that of this study with decreasing levels of satisfaction to the age of thirty-four and a general increase thereafter.

4. Highest level of education attained: The mean satisfaction score for respondents with three years of university or less was 68.5. Respondents holding a B.Ed. degree scored an average of 67.1. Those holding some other bachelor degree and a teaching certificate averaged 67.8; those holding a master's, 68.1; and those holding a doctorate, 56.0. Neither the variance between the groups nor the linear test for trend across the group means was significant.

The above analyses did not concur with those of other studies. Holdaway[16] found satisfaction to decrease to the level of two bachelor's degrees and to increase after that level. It should be noted, however, that Holdaway had separate scores for respondents with one, two, and three years of university training. Hadaway's[17] study also revealed significant differences between teachers with various levels of education, but this only on two of his twenty job satisfaction subscales.

5. Preparation: Foreign language specialists within the field of education had a mean satisfaction score of 66.7 while specialists not in education averaged 66.3. Those whose training was in education without a major in foreign languages averaged 69.9 and those without specializing in either education or foreign languages averaged 69.1. The differences between these groups was significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level, due largely to the higher satisfaction scores of those who have no specialization in

foreign languages, regardless of whether their preparation had been within or outside the field of education.

While studies such as that of Lacy[18] compared teachers of different types of preparation, no job satisfaction studies were found which would allow a comparison regarding whether teachers tended to be more satisfied if teaching in their major area of preparation. The finding that teachers with no specialization in foreign languages were more satisfied than those with such a specialization was somewhat surprising: studies dealing with curriculum implementation, such as that of Newton and Housego[19], tended to indicate that preparation in a given area would lead to more positive attitudes regarding curriculum implementation.

6. Teaching experience: The mean satisfaction scores for those indicating experience of zero to four years was 67.4; five to nine years was 66.4; ten to fourteen years was 66.2; fifteen to nineteen years was 69.4; twenty to twenty-four years was 67.9; and twenty-five or more years was 71.8. While the variance between the groups was not significant, the linear test for trend across group means was significant. The slight decline in mean satisfaction scores between zero and fourteen years of experience and a general increase thereafter showed a linear relationship significant at a level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

The finding of generally higher levels of satisfaction among more experienced teachers confirmed similar findings as reported by Chase[20], Lacy[21], Karolat[22], and Hadaway[23]. Dangharn[24] also had found previous experience to be related to the specific factor of teacher attitude toward participation in curriculum planning and innovation. And trends very similar to that of the present study showing an initial decrease of satisfaction levels and a subsequent increase of such levels when plotted against teaching experience were reported by Holdaway[25] and by Remple and Bentley[26].

7. Years in present school: The mean satisfaction score for those indicating zero to four years in their present school was 67.1. Those marking five to nine years average 67.0; ten to fourteen years averaged 68.1; fifteen to nineteen years averaged 67.7; twenty to twenty-four years averaged 75.2; and twenty-five or more years averaged 76.0. Neither the variance of means between the groups nor the contrasts across the group means proved significant.

While an initial inspection did indicate a trend for generally higher satisfaction levels with increasing service in the specific school, this tendency was not sufficiently strong to become statistically significant. Thus, while some similarity may be noted with the significant trends that emerged from the analysis of age and total experience groups, the strength did not match the findings of Dangharn[27], Hadaway[28], and Holdaway[29], who reported significant positive correlations between job satisfaction and service in the teacher's current school.

8. Teaching level: The two elementary teachers had a mean satisfaction score of 71.5. The junior high teachers averaged 67.3, while those in senior high schools averaged 67.2. Respondents with combined elementary

and junior high levels scored 69.2, while a junior and senior high combination resulted in 67.2. Respondents from schools with all three levels averaged 67.6. The variance between these groups in mean satisfaction scores was not significant.

A comparison of these results with other research findings was made difficult by two factors: first, the small number of elementary respondents in this study, and secondly, the tendency of other researchers not to differentiate between junior and senior high school teachers at the secondary level. Belasco and Alutto[30] and Chase[31] did report elementary teachers to be more satisfied than secondary teachers. Holdaway[32] also reported elementary teachers to be more satisfied than those in higher grades and further specified that only a one percent difference existed between junior and senior high school teachers with regard to the number of respondents indicating themselves to be satisfied.

9. Administrative duties: Those teachers performing uniquely classroom duties averaged a mean satisfaction score of 67.4. Teachers who were department heads averaged 68.2. Those with duties as associate or vice-principal scored 69.2, while principals averaged 70.7. The variance for these groups was not statistically significant. Also, while the mean satisfaction score shows gradual increases with higher positions in the schools' administrative hierarchy, this relationship of means was not significant.

No previous studies of teacher job satisfaction had been found to compare the levels of satisfaction between teachers and administrator-teachers. Several studies including those of Chase[33], Francoeur[34], Fast[35], and Barrett[36] have indicated that involvement in decision-making was significantly related to job satisfaction. Assuming that higher levels of administrator-teachers are more involved in decision-making than teachers, the findings of this study confirmed the trend but not the strength of these other studies.

10. Foreign language(s) taught: French teachers averaged a mean satisfaction score of 67.3. German teachers averaged 66.9. Ukrainian teachers averaged 73.0. The one Spanish teacher scored 72.0. Those teaching more than one language averaged 66.2. The variance between these groups was not significant.

The review of the literature had not led to any expectation of differences between the different languages taught. It was interesting to note, however, that Brophy[37] reported the teacher's use of self-created materials as a positive factor in the classroom and this study found teachers of Ukrainian to have the highest level of satisfaction. It was noted by those coding the questionnaire that these same teachers often reported using no set program or being required to create their own materials. While further exploration of Brophy's findings would seem to merit further consideration it must be emphasized that the observations of this study did not reach statistical significance.

11. Program: The mean satisfaction score for those teachers using only "Le Français International" was 66.4. Those using "Le Français International" in conjunction with another method averaged 66.1. Teachers using "Voix et Images de France" had a mean score of 69.6, while those using "J'écoute, je parle" had 70.2, and those using "Ecouter et parler" had 74.1. Respondents reporting the use of some other program averaged 67.3 and those using a combination of French programs not including "Le Français International" averaged 67.6. The average for methods in German, Ukrainian or a combination of languages was not divided into cells but their combined mean satisfaction score was 68.4. None of these differences were statistically significant.

As anticipated after examining the research on curricular innovations, the teachers using the newest French program, "Le Français International", had the lowest mean satisfaction score. However, studies such as those of Newton and Housego[38] and Stern and Keisler[39] have pointed out that in addition to the program itself, the dissatisfaction may stem from the manner of its implementation by the administration.

12. Number of other subjects taught: Respondents teaching only modern languages had a mean satisfaction score of 67.9. For those teaching one, two, three, or more other subjects, the respective scores were 66.0, 67.0, 70.0 and 69.3. The variance between these groups was not significant and no significant relationship of contrasts in group means was found. Lacy[40] had found "teaching load" to be significantly related to job satisfaction in an inverse relationship. This factor, however, comprised the amount of preparation time, the number of extra-curricular duties, and class size in addition to the number of classes.

13. School size: The mean satisfaction score for teachers working in schools with less than 200 pupils was 67.6. Teachers in schools with enrollments of 200 - 399, 400 - 599, 600 - 1,000, and over 1,000 had mean satisfaction scores of 67.5, 68.9, 65.1 and 67.9 respectively. Neither the variance between these groups nor the relationship of contrasts in group means was statistically significant.

The lack of any statistically significant differences in satisfaction attributable to school confirmed the finding of Remple and Bentley[41]. Other studies had reported significant differences in specific areas but these were not consistent with, for example, Bridges[42] reporting teachers in smaller schools to be more satisfied about their participation in decision-making and Aikenhead[43] reporting teachers in larger schools to be more satisfied about available facilities.

14. Number of colleagues teaching modern languages: Those respondents who were the only modern language teacher in their school had a mean satisfaction score of 67.5. Those with one, two, three, or more modern language colleagues had mean satisfaction scores of 67.2, 69.8, 67.2, and 69.5 respectively. The variance between these groups was not significant and no significant relationship between the means was found.

Lacy[44] had found the level of job satisfaction to increase among business education teachers as the size of their department increased. This trend could not be confirmed among Alberta's modern language teachers by the present study.

15. Community size: The mean satisfaction score for teachers in communities with a population of less than 5,000 was 68.5. Teachers from towns of 5,000 - 10,000 people averaged 67.5, while those from towns of 10,001 - 25,000 averaged 68.6. Respondents from cities of 25,001 - 50,000 people averaged 66.2, those from centers of 50,001 - 100,000 averaged 68,7, and those from centers of over 100,000 people averaged 66.4. Neither the differences between these groups nor the relationship between their means proved to be statistically significant.

Citing reasons of greater freedom, better resources, and higher salaries, Hoppock[45] had found in his 1935 study that teachers living in larger communities tended to be more satisfied. Lacy[46] in her 1968 study could not confirm such a trend and this study concurred with her findings.

16. Class size: Teachers having class sizes of less than fifteen students, fifteen to nineteen students, twenty to twenty-four students, twenty-five to twenty-nine students, thirty to thirty-four students, and thirty-five or more students respectively, averaged satisfaction scores of 67.7, 68.2, 66.7, 68.0, 69,2, and 56.0. The variation in the mean satisfaction scores was not significant and no significant relationship between these means emerged.

The lack of any significant relationship between job satisfaction and average class size concurred with the results reported by Lacy[47]. Worthy of further consideration, however, were the comments of several teachers who indicated that an average number did not indicate the actual nature of their class sizes.

17. Professional affiliation: Respondents belonging solely to the Alberta Modern Language Council (MLC) had a mean satisfaction score of 66.4. Teachers with a membership in the Association Canadienne-Française de l'Alberta or in the Alliance Française averaged 67.1. Those belonging to a German, Ukrainian or other ethnic organization had an average satisfaction score of 71.6. Respondents belonging to both the MLC and the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers had an average satisfaction of 71.2, while those belonging to both the MLC and an ethnic or cultural organization had an average score of 70.0. Those having three or more professional organization memberships as well as those holding no professional organization membership had a mean satisfaction score of 67.3. The differences between these means for the various possibilities of professional affiliation were not significant.

Despite suggestions made in such studies as those of Aikenhead[48] and Tardif[49] that membership in professional organizations might offer resources that would engender greater job satisfaction, no such relationship was found. This conclusion was similar to that of Lacy[50] who found that affiliation with business education organizations was not related to greater job satisfaction among business education teachers.

18. Semestering: Teachers working with semestered courses had a mean satisfaction score of 67.4, while those teaching only full years courses had a score of 67.2. Those who taught some semestered and some non-semestered courses had a mean satisfaction score of 69.0. While teachers with both types of courses were somewhat more satisfied, none of the differences relating to semestering proved to be statistically significant.

Francoeur[51] had found scheduling, as a general factor, to be a source of dissatisfaction among Quebec teachers. Specifically examining semestering practices, this study could not confirm this aspect of scheduling as being related to job satisfaction.

19. Teaching mother tongue: Respondents whose subject area was also their mother tongue averaged a satisfaction score of 67.9, while those whose subject area was not their mother tongue averaged 67.3. This difference in mean satisfaction scores was not statistically significant.

Several researchers such as Okonkwa[52], Politzer and Wise[53], and Truex[54], had indicated that mastery of the subject area by the teacher was related to job satisfaction or success. Using the related measure of teaching one's native language, however, this study was unable to confirm such a conclusion.

20. Input into present curriculum: Respondents who reported having had input into the present curriculum had a mean satisfaction score of 67.5, while teachers who reported no such input averaged 67.4. This difference was statistically insignificant.

While numerous studies such as those of Barrett[55], Belasco and Alutto[56], Hawley[57], and Hewitson[58] have indicated the importance of teacher participation in curricular decisions, this study failed to confirm a direct relationship between participation and job satisfaction. Barrett's study, however, pointed out the distinction between nominal and effective participation and noted that only participation which was perceived as being effectual was related to job satisfaction. The present study made no such distinction and this may partially account for the lack of significant results.

F. Correlations Between Job Satisfaction and Curricular Influence Items

Using the program "BMDP8D: missing value correlation", coefficients of correlation were calculated. Using a level of significance of 0.01, values of greater than 0.01400 were considered significant. An examination of the correlation between each of the curricular influence items and the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction score disclosed thirty-four items which were significant, as shown in Table VII.

As revealed in the table, a wide variety of curricular aspects showed low but significant correlation with job satisfaction. Ten items, namely numbers 20, 15, 55, 14, 25, 3, 2, 45, 37, and 38, concerned relations with

TABLE VII

CURRICULAR INFLUENCES SHOWING SIGNIFICANT CORRELATION ($\alpha = 0.01$) WITH THE BRAYFIELD-ROTHE JOB SATISFACTION SCORE

	Item	r
20.	School and system administrators are supportive	0.3071
15.	Administrator and teacher expectations are congruent	0.2896
17.	Student feedback is perceived as helpful in revising teaching methods and programs	0.2758
44.	Satisfaction with grade level assignment	0.2653
9.	Extra-curricular duties do not interfere with teaching duties	0.2510
50.	Satisfaction with program being taught	0.2502
55.	Colleagues and administration consider modern languages important	0.2437
14.	Adequate recognition exists for program work	0.2372
25.	Supervisor feedback is adequate	0.2270
46.	Freedom to use one's normal teaching style	0.2241
59.	Community values foreign language(s)	0.2227
31.	Students have generally high expectations of foreign language program	0.2188
6.	Preparation, correction, and clerical duties do not hinder effective teaching of program	0.1927
35.	Little difficulty in arranging participation of native speakers in program	0.1855
52.	Range of student abilities poses few planning problems	0.1792
34.	Possibility for teacher innovations	0.1779
36.	Freedom to select teaching methods	0.1753
58.	Freedom to select teaching materials	0.1750
18.	Would not prefer assignment in another subject area	0.1695
12.	Have ability to select and adapt curriculum	0.1692
21.	Teacher's needs and preferences are met in provincial curriculum	0.1629
3.	Expectations held of teacher and his role are clear	0.1593
29.	Freedom to organize and sequence the detailed content of classes	0.1586
61.	Teacher has sufficient input in development of innovations	0.1571

Cont'd...

TABLE VII (Cont'd)

	Item	r
2.	Current teacher evaluation methods are fair	0.1518
45.	Politics have not affected the development of foreign language programs	0.1502
13.	Adequate provisions exist for upgrading	0.1493
48.	Reasonable input into choice of text	0.1491
5.	Hold enough authority to meet curriculum demands	0.1466
24.	Most students perceived as capable of handling program	0.1459
28.	Freedom to select subject matter	0.1422
37.	Supervision is competent and helpful	0.1419
38.	Colleagues and administration respect teacher's competence as a foreign language teacher	0.1406
43.	Provincial curriculum values are compatible to teacher	0.1400

administrators and supervisors. These items tended to indicate that teachers with competent, supportive administrators who are respectful of the importance of foreign languages, were generally more satisfied in their work than those who indicated lower scores for these items. Another ten items, 46, 35, 34, 36, 58, 29, 61, 48, 5, and 28, related to aspects of freedom. High scores indicating freedom regarding subject matter, materials, method, teaching style, textbook choice, course organization, and the possibility of innovating, all correlated with high job satisfaction scores. Eight situational items, numbers 44, 50, 59, 31, 52, 18, 13, and 24, indicated a correlation with job satisfaction. These items included satisfactory grade and subject area assignments, a satisfactory program, relatively homogenous classes of capable students with high expectations, adequate upgrading possibilities, and a supportive community. The three teachers' qualities of confidence in their ability to adapt curricula (item 12), positively perceiving the feedback from students (item 17), and feeling a congruency with the provincial curriculum's values (items 23, 43), all correlated with high job satisfaction scores. Finally, the teacher's positive outlook on their extra-curricular duties (item 19), and their clerical duties (item 6) correlated with high job satisfaction ratings.

Using a level of significance of 0.05, with r greater than 0.11, a further six curricular items reached a low but significant level of correlation with the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction score. These additional items dealt with the perception that supervisors did not over-stress adherence to the provincial curriculum or the authorized textbook (item 19) the perception of provincial curricular changes as feasible in one's own classes (item 26), the perception of the provincial curriculum as sufficiently adaptable to meet the students' needs (item 30), the perception of professional organizations and publications as beneficial (item 10), the perception of the provincial curriculum and one's program as clear (item 40).

G. Factor Analysis of Curricular Influence Variables

The program "BMDP4M: factor analysis of correlation or co-variance matrix", was used to examine the sixty-five curricular influence variables for tendencies to group by correlation. Using rotated factor loadings, the program identified eighteen separate factors. An examination of these revealed thirteen factors which could be labelled. These factors and their loadings may be found in Table VIII. While the program replaced loadings of less than 0.25 by zero, it should be noted that values of less than 0.30 were ignored in the following descriptions.

The first factor comprised eleven items with loadings greater than 0.3. These items appeared to relate to *curriculum decision-making autonomy*. Specifically, the factor included the freedom to select subject matter, program materials, methodology, and course organization. Freedom over the choice of textbook and the possibility of using a combination of texts and methods were also included. Perceptions of adequate input into the setting of program outlines and the development of innovations were also in this

TABLE VIII

SORTED FACTORS, COMPONENTS, AND LOADINGS

Factor Number (Name)	Component Items	Loadings
1. (Curriculum decision-making autonomy)	48. Reasonable input into choice of text	0.736
	58. Freedom to select teaching materials	0.730
	28. Freedom to select subject matter	0.718
	4. Freedom to use a combination of methods, texts	0.645
	36. Freedom to select teaching methods	0.519
	61. Teacher has sufficient input into development of innovations	0.498
	29. Freedom to organize and sequence the detailed content of classes	0.426
	30. Provincial curriculum sufficiently adaptable to meet student needs	0.332
	50. Satisfaction with program being taught	0.322
	27. Teacher involvement in setting broad outlines for instructional programs	0.306
	21. Teacher's needs and preferences are met in provincial curriculum	0.303
2. (Teacher resources)	37. Supervision is competent and helpful	0.654
	41. Adequate in-service programs are conducted	0.651
	32. Sufficient contact with other foreign language professionals: teachers, curriculum workers	0.607
	22. Availability of assisting personnel	0.578
	13. Adequate provisions exist for upgrading	0.541

Cont'd...

TABLE VIII (Cont'd)

Factor Number (Name)	Component Items	Loadings
	25. Supervisor feedback is adequate	0.524
	14. Adequate recognition exists for program work	0.398
	42. Innovations are clearly explained	0.313
3. (Programming and the teacher)	43. Provincial curriculum values are compatible to the teacher	0.741
	42. Innovations are clearly explained	0.653
	46. Freedom to use one's normal teaching style	0.485
	21. Teacher's needs and preferences are met in provincial curriculum	0.396
	26. Provincial curriculum innovations are feasible for direct classroom use	0.394
	40. Provincial curriculum and program being used are clear	0.392
	56. Provincial innovations are necessary	0.324
	50. Satisfaction with program being taught	0.312
4. (Status of modern languages)	55. Colleagues and administration consider modern languages important	0.717
	59. Community values modern language(s)	0.670
	20. School and system administrators are supportive	0.646
	15. Administrator and teacher expectations are congruent	0.435
	45. Politics have not affected the development of foreign language programs	0.382

Cont'd...

TABLE VIII (Cont'd)

Factor Number (Name)	Component Items	Loadings
	38. Colleagues and administration respect the teacher's competence as a foreign language teacher	0.323
5. (Teacher Tasks)	6. Preparation, correction, and clerical duties do not hinder effective teaching of program	0.765
	9. Extra-curricular duties do not interfer with teaching duties	0.737
	8. Curriculum work demands do not interfer with classroom work	0.648
	54. Adequate preparation time in school day	0.337
	5. Hold enough authority to meet curriculum demands	0.319
6. (General resources)	51. Availability of suitable teaching materials	0.701
	62. Availability of supplemental materials to accompany program	0.699
	39. Adequacy or program funding	0.522
	40. Provincial curriculum and program being used are clear	0.420
	54. Adequate preparation time in school day	0.346
7. (Work climate and teacher situation)	3. Expectations held of teacher and his role are clear	0.643
	2. Current teacher evaluation methods are fair	0.615
	1. Provincial curriculum goals and objectives are feasible and attainable	0.547
	15. Administrator and teacher expectations are congruent	0.437

Cont'd...

TABLE VIII (Cont'd)

Factor Number (Name)	Component Items	Loadings
	14. Adequate recognition exists for program work	0.377
8. (Student considerations)	24. Most students perceived as capable of handling program	0.681
	30. Provincial curriculum sufficiently adaptable to meet student needs	0.530
	52. Range of student abilities poses few planning problems	0.491
	26. Provincial curriculum innovations are feasible for direct classroom use	0.459
	1. Provincial curriculum goals and objectives are feasible and attainable	0.338
9. (Teacher Participation in curriculum decision-making)	11. Satisfactory amount of participation in provincial curriculum development	0.755
	53. Satisfactory amount of participation in school system's curriculum development	0.677
	65. Satisfactory amount of change in the foreign language curriculum	0.312
10. (Upgrading of methodology)	23. Desire to take additional curriculum and methodology courses	0.807
	63. Desire to take additional language training	0.744
	17. Student feedback is perceived as helpful in revising teaching methods and programs	0.313
11. (Teacher autonomy)	29. Freedom to organize and sequence the detailed content of classes	0.560

Cont'd...

TABLE VIII (Cont'd)

Factor Number (Name)	Component Items	Loadings
	34. Possibility for teacher innovations	0.551
	12. Have ability to select and adapt curriculum	0.500
	33. Out-of-school experience deemed valuable in program preparation	0.495
	38. Colleagues and administration respect the teacher's competence as a foreign language teacher	0.471
	28. Freedom to select subject matter	0.338
12. (Classroom conditions)	31. Students have generally high expectation of foreign language program	0.716
	18. Would not prefer assignment in other subject area	0.638
	44. Satisfaction with grade level assignment	0.333
	52. Range of student abilities poses few planning problems	0.329
13. (Acceptance of status quo)	64. Satisfaction with ongoing review and revision of program in school systems	0.703
	65. Satisfactory amount of change in the foreign language curriculum	0.636
	57. No preference for a more highly structured provincial curriculum	0.329

factor as were the perceptions of the provincial curriculum as being adaptable and meeting teacher's needs. A final item included in this autonomy factor was the rating of their present program as satisfactory.

The second factor emerging from the analysis comprised eight items which could be labelled as *sources of teacher resources*. These items included the competence of supervisors, the availability of assistance personnel, the amount of contact with other foreign language professionals, and the adequacy of in-service programs. Other aspects of this factor were the possibility for upgrading, the quality of supervisors' feedback, and the according of recognition for effective program development and implementation. The final item, concerning the clarity of external innovations, could also be considered as a teacher resource.

The third factor grouped together eight items relating to *programming and the teacher*. They included the compatability of the teacher's values with those of the provincial curriculum, and the perception of innovations as being necessary, clear and feasible. Relating to the school's particular program the items concerned its clarity, the degree to which it met the teacher's needs and preferences, its overall acceptability, and the teacher's freedom to incorporate one's own teaching style into the foreign language program.

The fourth factor contained six items which concerned *perceptions of the status of modern languages*. Included among these were the respect of colleagues and the administration for the importance of foreign languages in the curriculum, their respect for the teacher's expertise in this area, and their support for the foreign language program. Related to this were the lack of hindrances from politics and a congruency of the teacher's and the administration's expectations generally. A final status-related item concerned the community's understanding and valuing the importance of the foreign language.

The fifth factor comprised five items which related to *teacher tasks*. The items involved consideration of clerical duties, extra-curricular duties and curriculum work demands as an integral part of the teacher's work. In addition to these considerations were the perceptions of having adequate time for preparation and curriculum work during the school day and holding sufficient authority over the curriculum to meet the demands made on the teacher.

The sixth factor grouped together five items which could be labelled as *general resources*. Specifically the availability of suitable program materials and supplementary materials, and adequate funding headed this list. Also included were the availability of adequate preparation time and the clarity of the program being used.

The seventh factor consisted of five items which related to the *work climate or situation of the teacher*. These items included the existence of clear expectations regarding the role of the teacher and fair methods of teacher evaluation. The item on congruent administrator and teacher

expectations appeared again as did the recognition of work in program development and implementation. Also included in this factor was the judgment of the curriculum's goals as feasible and attainable.

The eighth factor comprised five items which centered on *student considerations*. Among these were the capability of the students and the range of student abilities in any given class. Also pertinent to student considerations were the feasibility and adaptability of the provincial curriculum and the feasibility of provincial innovations.

The ninth factor primarily concerned teacher participation in *curriculum decision-making*. The three items included satisfaction with the role the teacher plays in curriculum development at the system and the provincial level and no perception of the need for more change in the foreign language curriculum.

The tenth factor which emerged comprised three items relating to the *upgrading of methodology*. The items were a desire to take more methods courses, to take more courses in the foreign language, and an openness to the value of student feedback in revising methods and programs.

The eleventh factor comprised six items which appeared to relate to autonomy as did the first factor, but as *teacher autonomy* which operated at a more personal level. This factor again grouped the freedom to select subject matter and to organize course content. Furthermore, it included the acceptance of personal innovations by the school, the teacher's sense of being capable of selecting and adapting curricula for classroom use, the sense of having valuable out-of-school resources to draw upon, and the sense of being respected for one's competence by one's colleagues.

The twelfth factor related to situational aspects as did factor seven, however, this factor was more restricted to *classroom conditions*. The four items included general contentment with subject assignment, grade level assignment, the range of student abilities, and the perception of students' expectations of the foreign language program.

The thirteenth and final identifiable factor regrouped three items which concerned an acceptance of the *status quo*. These items comprised the lack of desire for more change generally, or more structure more specifically, and the satisfaction with the present system of reviewing and revising of the foreign language program.

NOTES

1. E.A. Holdaway, *Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1978, p. 58.

2. A. Lacy, *An Analysis of Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Teachers in Ohio*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Univerisity of Ohio, 1968, p. 66.

3. F.J. Hadaway, *Selected Personal Characteristics Related to Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Teachers*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

4. F.S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Volume 33, Number 3, November, 1951.

5. H.G. Karolat, *Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Comprehensive Schools in Saskatchewan*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

6. J.A. Belasco; J.A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 8, Number 1, Winter 1972.

7. P.H. Hennessy, *Teacher Militancy: A Comparative Study of Ontario, Quebec and New York Teachers*, Ottawa, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1975.

8. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

9. T.M. Butler, "Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers", *Clearing House*, Volume 36, Number 1, September 1961.

10. Chase, *Op. Cit.*, 1951.

11. H.V. McClusky; F.J. Strayer, "Reactions of Teachers to the Teaching Situation: A Study of Job Satisfaction", *The School Review*, Volume 48, Number 8, October 1940.

12. Karolat, *Op. Cit.*, 1971.

13. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

14. Hadaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

15. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

16. *Loc. Cit.*

17. Hadaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

18. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*,1968.

19. E.E. Newton; J.E. Housego, "Teacher Reaction to Change: A Case Study", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 6, Number 7, April 1967.

20. Chase, *Op. Cit.*, 1951.

21. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

22. Karolat, *Op. Cit.*, 1971.

23. Hadaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

24. N. Dangharn, *An Investigation of Teacher Innovation and Attitude Toward Participation in Curriculum Planning and Use*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1978.

25. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

26. A. Remple; R.R. Bentley, "Teacher Morale: Relationship with Selected Factors", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter 1970.

27. Danghard, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

28. Hadaway, *Op. Cit.*,1978.

29. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

30. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

31. Chase, *Op. Cit.*, 1951.

32. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978.

33. Chase, *Op. Cit.*, 1951.

34. K. Francoeur, *Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

35. R.G. Fast, *Leader Behavior of Principals as it Relates to Teacher Satisfaction*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

36. T.C. Barrett, *Relationship Between Perceived Faculty Participation in the Decision-Making Process and Job Satisfaction in the Community Colleges of North Carolina*, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1969.

37. J.E. Brophy, "Achievement Correlates", in: *Evaluating Educational Performance*, H.J. Walberg (ed.), Berkeley, California, McCutcheon Publishing Company, 1974.

38. Newton, Housego, *Op. Cit.*, 1967.

39. C. Stern; E. Keisler, "Teacher Attitudes and Attitude Change", *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Volume 10, Number 2, Winter 1977.

40. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

41. Remple; Bentley, *Op. Cit.*, 1970.

42. E.M. Bridges, "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making", *Administrator's Notebook*, Volume 12, Number 2, May 1964.

43. J.D. Aikenhead, "Teacher Satisfactions and Discouragements", *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 6, Number 2, June 1960.

44. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

45. R. Hoppock, *Job Satisfaction*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935.

46. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

47. Lacy, *Ibid.*

48. Aikenhead, *Op. Cit.*, 1960.

49. C. Tardif, *Teacher Perceptions of the Cultural Goal in Second Language Teaching*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

50. Lacy, *Op. Cit.*, 1968.

51. Francoeur, *Op. Cit.*, 1963.

52. A.E.N. Okonkwa, *A Study of Teachers' Attitudes and Their Relation to Work Satisfaction*, unpublished M.Ed. thesis University of Alberta, 1966.

53. P.L. Politzer; L. Wise, *The Successful Foreign Language Teacher*, Philadelphia, Chilton, 1970.

54. N.H. Truex, "Factors Critical to College Teaching Success or Failure", *Improving College and University Teaching*, Volume 23, Number 4, Winter 1975.

55. Barrett, *Op. Cit.*, 1969.

56. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

57. G.B. Hawley, *Actual and Preferred Levels of Curriculum Decision-Making as Perceived by Selected Groups*, unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

58. M.T. Hewitson, *The Professional Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION OF THE ANALYSIS

A. Characteristics of Respondents

Since the sample of this study comprised only modern language teachers it was difficult to compare the data obtained with other data available on the demographic characteristics of Alberta teachers. Furthermore, the nature of the mailing list which was used also restricted the sample by eliminating a large number of elementary teachers. Nonetheless, using statistics presented by Holdaway[1] for a few point comparisons there would appear to be little reason to doubt the representative nature of the sample. This study found 61 percent of its respondents to be female while Holdaway reported a female population of 56 percent, a difference of 5 percent. Holdaway reported a married population of 76 percent while this study showed the married respondents as comprising 70 percent of the sample, a difference of 6 percent. Regarding age, the present study recorded 37 percent of its teachers as under 30 years old while Holdaway's population listed 40 percent in that category, a difference of 3 percent. Concerning education, the present sample included 40 percent of the respondents holding a B.Ed. degree and 12 percent holding a Master's degree, while Holdaway's population included 46 percent and 9 percent in those categories. The present study showed 30 percent of the respondents with less than five years of experience, 31 percent between five and ten years, and 40 percent over ten years. Holdaway reported respective figures of 34 percent, 25 percent, and 42 percent, differing only by 4, 6, and 2 points for these categories. Thus, on the basis of these point comparisons, the sample of the present study generally showed slightly more female respondents, slightly fewer married respondents, somewhat younger respondents, a somewhat higher degree of education among respondents and a somewhat less experienced group of respondents. However, these differences between the present study and Holdaway's population were minimal and might be accounted for by the two year interval between these studies and the limitation of the present study to modern language teachers primarily at the secondary level. In the light, then, of these comparisons, these differences, and the 55.3 percent rate of return, it was with considerable confidence that the sample of this study was deemed representative of modern language teachers throughout Alberta.

B. Measure of Job Satisfaction

As was noted in the description of the measures of job satisfaction, the results of the second, self-rated overall, item compared very favorably to the results obtained by Holdaway. Both this measure and the third, behavioral measure concurred with the general findings of researchers, like Andrisani[2], that generally fewer than fifteen percent of a population dislike their jobs. Furthermore, both of these measures correlated very highly with the Brayfield-Rothe measure. These results allowed confidence in using the Brayfield-Rothe scores as a valid measure of job satisfaction in the further analyses.

In addition, the three measures of job satisfaction and the above comparisons showed a generally high level of job satisfaction among the sample of modern language teachers. Approximately 84 percent of the sample were satisfied with their jobs while only 9 percent were dissatisfied. But while this level of satisfaction appeared high, it was still comparable to that of other Alberta teachers and to other segments of the work force. Alberta's modern language teachers do not appear to have either an exceptionally high nor low level of job satisfaction.

C. Curricular Influences

All sixty-five curricular influence items were included because previous research had indicated or suggested some connection between them and teachers' attitudes, morale, or job satisfaction. All of the items were dealt with as discrete items, but the analyses performed allowed several classifications of items to be made. On the basis of the mean scores for each item the fifteen highest and lowest items were examined. It appeared that the respondents showed high agreement on several items concerning freedom within the school and within the class. High ratings were recorded on the positive perception of some resources, such as student feedback, professional organizations and personal ability. High agreement scores were found on the situational items of grade and subject assignment and respect accorded to the teacher by colleagues and administrators. And finally, teachers' desire for upgrading showed high agreement scores.

The low scores proved much more difficult to categorize, but there appeared to be negative perceptions of community values, achievement exceptions, and politics. Several situational items, such as class size, clerical duties, amount of preparation time, range of student abilities, and external examinations, all received generally low agreement scores. Finally, several matters of upgrading, such as in-service programs, university training, contact with fellow professionals, and participation in curriculum development and program review, all received low agreement scores.

Since the weighting of all the items was in the direction of suspected correlation with satisfaction, the high mean score items might be considered as satisfiers while the low score items might be considered as dissatisfiers. A cursory inspection of these groups would lead to consideration of the Herzberg theory. While it does appear that a split between job content factors and job context factors does exist, clear lines would be difficult to draw. For example, while most of the situational items existed among the low scores, two appeared among the high scores. Some consideration of Vroom's[3] examination of defense mechanisms or Wernimont's[4] intrinsic/extrinsic factors might be warranted by noting that the desire for upgrading by the individual is listed among the high, satisfaction scores while the possibilities for upgrading such as in-service programs appeared among the low, dissatisfaction scores. Thus a superficial inspection of the curricular influences for the highest and lowest agreement scores showed some tendency to divide along Herzberg's two factors, but certainly not for all items. Since the items were presented and treated as discrete items and not motivations or hygienes, further study would be required before any conclusions could be drawn from these results.

D. Comments

Just over one-fifth of the sample availed themselves of the open-ended question to make comments. This response displayed a concern of the sample with curricular influences since most of the comments reiterated or elaborated items of the questionnaire, confidence was maintained in the completeness of the inventory of curricular influence items which was developed.

In describing the comments, the general categories of community values, program time, supplemental materials, supervision, external exams, and job assignment were virtually all-inclusive. That the majority of comments concerned problems and matters of dissatisfaction, and could be categorized under these hygiene, or job-context, headings would again show a tendency to support Herzberg's two-factor theory. While this tendency was not tested as part of the present study, and the previous discussion of curricular influences raises some doubt the complete applicability of the theory, the examination of the comments does evidence a limited example of Herzberg's theory.

E. Personal-Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction

In testing for differences in the level of job satisfaction between different groups, within the personal and demographic variables, only two reached significant levels: sex and area of specialization.

That females were significantly more satisfied than males confirmed the findings of numerous other studies. Speculation as to the reasons for this difference might include the matter of salary, as raised by Remple and Bentley.[5] While male and female teachers in Alberta receive salaries based on equal pay scales, the male is more often in a position of providing the primary, if not sole, family income while the female is more often a provider of a supplementary income. It is also possible that for singles a given salary would be more acceptable to a female than a male because of differences in the lifestyles of the sexes. For example, males might be more likely to have independent accommodation, might eat out more often, and might be more extravagant on social outings. Another possible explanation discussed by Miskel, Glasnapp and Hatley,[6] might be that of primary life interest. Again it is possible that females view other interests, such as family, as their prime concern. Miskel *et al* suggested that the primacy of work in one's life affected the factors which act as satisfiers. Thus it is possible that females are more satisfied because their jobs are not their primary life concern, and frustrations or dissatisfactions at work might simply be ignored. And related to these possible explanations is the matter of expectations. In light of the different roles and concerns of males and females it is very likely that they hold different expectations of their work situation. For example, males expect promotion to an administrative position, or might expect to be allowed more autonomy in curricular matters. Such expectations and their relation to the actual situation would reflect in job satisfaction, as was suggested by some of the discrepancy models of job satisfaction.

The finding that teachers who were foreign language specialists were less satisfied than non-specialists was surprising. However, perhaps some of the suggested reasons for the difference in levels of job satisfaction between the sexes might apply here as well. Possibly the discrepancy between the skills of a specialist and his students would exceed that between a non-specialist and his students, causing greater dissatisfaction for the specialist. Or perhaps a foreign language specialist aspires to a higher position because of his training and thus feels more dissatisfied with his present job than a non-specialist. Finally, the dissatisfaction of specialists may stem from constraints placed on them by their school, system, or the province, as suggested by Corwin[7] among others. For example, specialists may feel blocked by the amount of autonomy granted them, they may feel their talents are wasted on routine clerical matters, or they may be discouraged by the community's attitude to their special field.

In testing for co-variance between the level of job satisfaction and the ordered personal and demographic variables, two showed significant trends: age and total years of teaching experience.

The finding that increases in age corresponded significantly with increases in job satisfaction confirmed this trend, as previously noted, among several other studies. Commenting on his findings, which included a breakdown of the relationship between age and satisfaction with specific job aspects, Holdaway[8] suggested that "beginning teachers have higher expectations than do more experienced teachers concerning the allocation and availability of resources and professional assistance" which might account for greater dissatisfaction among younger teachers. It is also possible that the initial dissatisfaction experienced by some beginning teachers would cause them to leave the teaching profession, thus accounting for higher mean job satisfaction levels with increasing age. Furthermore, since the decision to leave teaching might be postponed for a few years because of the educational investment and low financial resources of beginning teachers, it is possible that this factor might account for the initial decline in job satisfaction levels which was then followed by a general increase. A third possible explanation, suggested by Newton and Housego[9] relates satisfaction to familiarity. Thus, as a teacher becomes more familiar with the curriculum and is better able to gauge materials to students, job satisfaction might increase. Also it is likely that, with age, a teacher acquires greater knowledge of his subject area and would feel more comfortable in teaching concepts within that field.

The significant relationship of trend between the level of job satisfaction and total years of teaching experience also confirmed a number of previous studies, as documented in the previous chapter. A logical connection exists between age and total years of teaching experience and, therefore, the possible explanations of high initial expectations, the attrition of dissatisfied teachers, and increasing familiarity with curriculum and subject matter would be equally plausible for the experience variable.

The importance of the relationships of the above four variables (sex, preparation, age, and total years of teaching experience) with job satisfaction are many but need to be developed according to the underlying reasons, such as those suggested, responsible for the relationships. However, more pertinent to this study is the fact that differences among teachers do exist and there is a need to have teachers treated with "decisional discrepancy", a term used by Belasco and Alutto[10]. Thus, for example, the guidelines provided to all modern language teachers may be too rigid for specialists while being just right for non-specialists. Or the amount of curricular autonomy which is acceptable to females may not be sufficient for males. There is a need, in light of these findings, to allow for a discrepancy to be made in making decisions affecting teachers for the differences between the teachers.

F. Curricular Influences and Job Satisfaction

To examine the relationship between each of the curricular influence items and job satisfaction, coefficients of correlation were calculated. The finding that forty, or 61.5 percent of the sixty-five items reached statistical significance at a level of 0.05 would appear to point to the importance of curricular influences to teacher job satisfaction. And the fact that thirty-four, or 52.3 percent of the items, reached the higher level of 0.01 would tend to strengthen their importance.

While this correlation cannot be interpreted as a causal relationship, it is important that the people who exert curricular influences upon the teacher, and the people who are concerned with the teacher's morale and well-being, be aware of the interplay or, the interaction between, these domains. It has been noted, in the discussion of this study's significance, that the ramifications of teacher satisfaction and of curricular matters include student achievement[11], student attitudes[12], school effectiveness[13], and teacher well-being[14]. It would appear possible that a sensitivity to teacher job satisfaction, when dealing with the forty significant curricular items, might have a beneficial effect on these areas; or conversely, remembering curriculum influences when dealing with teacher morale might also affect these areas. And it is important to remember that such awareness should not only exist among administrators and provincial officials, but also among the teachers themselves, if the effects of such awareness are to be realized.

G. Factors of Curricular Influence

In attempting to deal effectively with the forty curricular influence items that showed significant correlation to job satisfaction, subjective summary categories were used. These included items relating to administrators and supervisors, freedom, job assignment and situation, teacher self-confidence, and teachers' positive outlook. While these categories represent arbitrary designations of the factors, the importance of many of them became apparent in the review of the literature. For example, the

matter of freedom was found by Belasco and Alutto[15] to be related to job satisfaction and to several organizational outcomes. Similarly, the matter of the teacher's positive work outlook was found by Pidgeon[16] to be related to student achievement and by Meyers, Freidman and Gangham[17] to his own mental health. Thus, it is possible that these elements would show similar effects even in the more restricted area of curricular influences.

Beyond the subjective examination a statistical program of factor analysis was performed disclosing thirteen indentifiable factors. These factors, such as autonomy, resources, programming, tasks, work climate, students, decisional participation, and classroom condition, again were all factors which appeared important in the literature. And similarly, the importance of these factors would extend to many areas as was noted for more informally determined factors.

Thus, to summarize, while modern language teachers in Alberta appear to be generally satisfied with their jobs, significant differences exist along lines of sex, preparation, age, and total years of teaching experience. These differences would suggest the need for a differential approach in dealing with these groups of teachers. Furthermore, forty of the sixty-five curricular influence items showed significant correlations with job satisfaction. Thus it would appear that an interaction exists between them, an interaction which would be important in both the areas of curriculum decision-making and teacher morale. The analysis of the simple reactions to the curricular influences disclosed satisfaction and dissatisfaction items concerning curricular influences. While some grouping of these items was possible, it was not possible to confirm Herzberg's two factor theory. However, the curricular influence items did produce thirteen general factors by factor analysis. These factors tended to be factors which had appeared in the literature and which had been connected to many important outcomes, such as student achievement, program success, organizational efficiency, and teacher well-being. And thus the isolation of similar factors specifically in the area of curricular influences would appear to be an important part of this larger picture.

NOTES

1. E.A. Holdaway, *Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1978.

2. P.J. Andrisani, *Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience*, New York, Praeger, 1978, p. 245.

3. V.H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, New York, Wiley, 1964, p. 129.

4. P.F. Wernimont, "A Systems View of Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 56, Number 2, 1972.

5. A. Remple; R. Bentley, "Teacher Morale: Relationship with Selected Factors", *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 21, Number 4, Winter 1970.

6. C. Miskel; D. Glasnapp; R. Hatley, "A Test of the Inequality Theory for Job Satisfaction Using Educators' Attitudes to Work Motivation and Work Incentives", *Educational Administrators' Quarterly*, Vol. 11, Number 1.

7. R.G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance", *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 38, Number 4, Summer 1965.

8. Holdaway, *Op. Cit.*, 1978. p. 79.

9. E.E. Newton· I.E. Housego, "Teacher Reaction to Change: A Case Study", *The Canadian Administrator*, Volume 6, Number 7, April 1967.

10. J.A. Belasco; J.A. Alutto, "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Volume 8, Number 1, Winter 1972.

11. B. Rosenshine, *Teaching Behaviours and Student Achievement*, Slough, NFER, 1971.

12. S. Mallula, *Teacher Competency, Teacher Attitude and Student Attitude Toward Reading*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

13. R. Knoop; R. O'Reilly, *Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organizational Effectiveness of Elementary Schools*, paper to Canadian Association for Study of Educational Administration, Laval University, Quebec City, June 3, 1976.

14. J. Meyers; M.P. Freidman; E.J. Gangham, "The Effects of Consultee-Centered Consultation on Teacher Behavior", *Psychology in the Schools*, Volume 12, Number 3, July 1975.

15. Belasco; Alutto, *Op. Cit.*, 1972.

16. D. Pidgeon, *Expectation and Pupil Performance*, Stockholm, Almquist, 1970.

17. Meyers; Freidman; Gangham, *Op. Cit.*, 1975.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research study was to examine the relationship between the modern language teacher and the influence perceived by him in the area of curriculum. Specifically the teacher's level of job satisfaction was examined as it was noted that this variable, a comprehensive measure important in the work situation, might be influenced by factors such as those relating to curriculum.

The problem was postulated in three questions:

1. What is the overall degree of job satisfaction of modern language teachers in Alberta?
2. What do modern language teachers perceive to be the curricular influences which determine the approach that will be used in classroom?
3. What correlations, if any, exist between the perception of curricular influences and the overall job satisfaction of modern language teachers?

A. Methodology

To answer these questions, the first step taken was the construction of a three-part questionnaire. The first part elicited twenty personal and demographic variables which the review of literature had revealed as possibly being related to job satisfaction, curriculum, or both. The second part concentrated on curricular influences. An initial three hundred items, drawn from the literature, was reduced to a list of sixty-five items by a process of classification, combination, and elimination. The third part of the questionnaire was intended to measure each subject's level of job satisfaction. The twenty questions used in this third part comprised the eighteen-item Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index, an overall self-rating item, and a behavioral measure of job satisfaction.

The questionnaire was administered to 763 modern language teachers in Alberta. One month after the mailing of the questionnaires, 422 returns had been received, representing a response rate of 55.3 percent. Of these returns 365 questionnaires or 86.5 percent were usable and as such formed the sample for this study.

B. Findings

The first analysis of the data provided a description of the sample. In response to the first question posed by this study, the self-rating item revealed 27.1 percent of the respondents to be "very satisfied", 56.4 percent to be "satisfied", 7.1 percent to be "undecided", 8.8 percent to be "dissatisfied" and 0.3 percent to be "very dissatisfied". The Brayfield-Rothe

Job Satisfaction Index showed a mean satisfaction score of 67.48 out of a possible ninety, a range of 30 - 89, and a standard deviation of 9.65. Further analysis revealed a highly significant correlation of 0.785 between the self-rating item and the Brayfield-Rothe score. The behavioral items also showed a high correlation of 0.685 with the Brayfield-Rothe score, thus allowing an assurance of the validity of using the Brayfield-Rothe to measure job satisfaction.

In response to the second question posed by this study the first analysis also provided a description of respondent's reactions to the sixty-five curricular items. On a five point scale with higher numbers postulated to correlate positively with satisfaction, the range of means for the curricular influence items was from 1.852 to 4.164. An examination of the fifteen items with the highest mean scores revealed generally strong positive feelings in four areas which could arbitrarily be labelled as freedom, ability, upgrading and work situation. The respondents largely agreed that they had enough freedom in matters of teaching style, choice of methods, course organization, and the development of innovations. The sample also showed that the respondents held positive views of their own foreign language ability, the value of their own out-of-school experiences, and the value of available resources in professional organizations and publications. Respondents tended to affirm a desire to take further courses to improve their language skills and their methods. Finally, high agreement scores were disclosed in the matters of satisfaction with subject and grade-level assignments.

The fifteen items with the lowest mean agreement scores revealed generally strong negative feelings concerning certain constraints on curriculum development and implementation. Low agreement scores were found concerning the adequacy of preparation time, contact with professional colleagues, inservice programs, and program review. The sample also tended to show disagreement regarding the acceptability of class size, the range of student abilities, the amount of clerical work, and the role of politics. Other items showing high disagreement scores concerned teacher participation in curriculum decision-making, community values, external examinations, and the possibility of reaching European modern language standards.

An examination of the seventy-seven respondents who provided comments showed teacher concern with the influence of community values, the problem posed by the factor of time in program development and implementation, the paucity of usable supplemental materials, the lack of supervision, and the changing emphasis of provincial exams.

Before exploring the possible correlations between job satisfaction and the curricular items, the data were analysed for any possible correlations between job satisfaction and the twenty selected personal and demographic factors. The results disclosed four relationships statistically significant at a level of 0.05. First, female modern language teachers were generally more satisfied than male modern language teachers. Second, non-foreign language specialists were generally more satisfied than the specialists. Third and fourth, possitive linear relationships were statistically significant between job satisfaction and age, and between job satisfaction and total years of teaching.

In response to the third question, the next analysis involved the determination of coefficients of correlation between the sixty-five curricular influence variables and the Brayfield-Rothe job satisfaction scores. At a level of significance of 0.01, thirty-four or fifty-two percent of the curricular influence items showed significant correlations with job satisfaction. Ten of these items related to supervisors and administrators: perception of their support and their clear expectations, fair evaluations, competent assistance, and respect. Another ten items related to matters of freedom: specifically regarding the choice of subject matter, materials, method, teaching style, textbook, course organization, and the possibility of innovating. Eight of the items related to situational factors: satisfactory grade level and subject area assignments, a satisfactory program, the capability of students, homogenous classes, adequate upgrading possibilities, and a supportive community. Finally, a number of curricular influence items focussing on the teacher correlated with job satisfaction: confidence in one's own ability to adapt curricula, openness to student feedback in curricular planning, congruency with the provincial curriculum's values, and a positive outlook on non-teaching duties. In addition to these, a further six items showed significant correlation with job satisfaction when a level of 0.05 was used. These items, also relating to supervisors, autonomy, situation, and teacher factors, would raise to 61.5 percent the number of curricular items which correlated significantly with job satisfaction.

The final statistical analysis performed was a factor analysis. This treatment of the data served to further answer question two concerning the specification of curricular influences. A total of eighteen factors were identified by the computer on the basis of correlations. Of these it was possible to label thirteen. First were eleven items which related to curriculum decision-making autonomy. Next eight items relating to resources for the teacher were sorted, and eight items relating to programming and the teacher were grouped. The fourth factor combined six items concerning various perceptions of the acceptance of the foreign language by different groups. The fifth and sixth factors each comprised five items with the former relating to aspects of the teacher's task and the latter relating to program resources. The seventh factor comprised five items which were labelled as various working conditions in the school, and the eighth factor also comprised five items which were labelled as student considerations. Factor nine grouped together three items relating to participation in the curriculum decision-making process and factor ten grouped together three items relating to upgrading. Six items were sorted under the eleventh factor which could be classified as personal autonomy, and four items were sorted under the twelfth factor and could be considered pertinent to the classroom situation. The final group of items to be labelled were the three items of the thirteenth factor which primarily concerned acceptance of the *status quo* in various areas.

C. Conclusions and Interpretations

With regard to the first question focussing on the overall degree of job satisfaction of Alberta modern language teachers, the analyses have shown a generally high level of job satisfaction, very similar to that of Alberta teachers as a whole.

Among the sample, significant differences in job satisfaction were only found between two groups: sex and area of specialization. That males were less satisfied may be attributable to such factors suggested in the literature as the primary importance of work in their lives, their role to provide the main family income, and higher expectations from their work. Speculation as to why modern language specialists were less satisfied than non-specialists may also be related to higher expectations, or to the discrepancies between theory and practice and between personal and student competence in the modern language, or also to the frustration of specialists with constraints placed on them by conditions within the school.

Among the sample, trends in levels of job satisfaction were only related significantly to two factors: age and total years of teaching experience. Possible reasons for increased levels of job satisfaction with increasing age and experience might include the natural attrition of dissatisfied teachers over the years and the increase of satisfaction with greater familiarity and mastery of the subject matter, the methodology and the curriculum.

With regard to the second question, focussing on curricular influences felt by modern language teachers, it appears that a large number of factors do affect the teacher. That 47.8 percent of the population completed this survey with twelve pages of questions demonstrated concern over such variables. That 21.1 percent of the respondents took the time to make comments elaborating their concern with these various curricular influences also emphasized the importance of such factors.

Finally, with regard to the third question, focussing on the correlations between the perceptions of curricular influences and the overall level of job satisfaction, 52.3 percent of the sixty-five curricular items showed a significant correlation at the 0.01 level, while 61.5 percent of the items showed a significant correlation at the 0.05 level. While many of these correlations were low, the fact of having isolated curricular influences from the many factors in the job situation, and the fact of having specified sixty-five items within that one area would not have led to the expectation of high correlations. Thus, the finding of statistically significant correlations for three-fifths of the items should be of importance to those concerned with making curricular decisions and to those concerned about teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, that a factor analysis of the sixty-five curricular influence items produced eighteen groupings, of which thirteen were readily identifiable, also would suggest that correlations between various curricular influences and job satisfaction might be even higher if related items were grouped before a study of their effect on job satisfaction.

D. Recommendations

On the basis of the conduct of this study and the analysis of the compiled data, several recommendations can be made.

First, this study was primarily descriptive and the analyses made were primarily correlational. Further research is suggested to determine the reasons or underlying mechanisms which are responsible for the results. For example, the reasons for greater job satisfaction among teachers who were not modern language specialists would be worthy of exploration.

Secondly, with a correlational study of various factors the direction of relationship cannot be determined. Further study is recommended to establish the direction of causality between those demographic and those curricular influence items which showed significant correlations with job satisfaction.

Thirdly, the factor analysis which was performed identified a number of groupings of the curricular influence items. The result of using these groupings in a study of the relationship between curricular influence variables and job satisfaction might add to a better understanding of the importance of those factors in the schools.

Fourthly, the sample of this study was composed primarily of junior high and senior high teachers. It is very possible that the elementary modern language teachers who for the majority spend less than one-third of their teaching time in that area, have different perceptions of these curricular influences and that those influences affect their job satisfaction levels differently. Further attention to this segment of the population is recommended.

Fifthly, while the majority of personal and demographic variables showed no correlation with job satisfaction, and while twenty-five of the curricular influence variables showed insignificant correlations with job satisfaction, the possibility exists that interaction effects of these factors would produce significant relationships. This may be a reason for the differences in findings between this and other studies and would, therefore, provide grounds for recommending further study of these variables in a study of multiple interactions.

Finally, while this project has been limited to the study of curricular influences as perceived by the teacher, it must be remembered that these items did not and do not exist in isolation. Attention to these factors should not detract attention from other components of the work situation. This study, with its focus on the teacher and curricular influences, was intended to provide a balance for previous research in those other areas. Further examination, therefore, is recommended to integrate these findings and to explore the ramifications of all of these influences upon the teacher, the pupil, and the education process.

APPENDIX A

PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

AND

CURRICULAR VARIABLES

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR

MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Notes: This questionnaire is intended for teachers of foreign languages who are engaged in such instruction for one-third or more of their teaching time.

The questionnaire comprises three sections and a total of 105 questions.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated.

PART I

Instructions: The following items concern personal and demographic variables. Please circle the letter of the appropriate response for each item.

1. Sex:
   (a) Male (b) Female — 1. a b

2. Marital status:
   (a) Single (c) Widow(er)
   (b) Married (d) Separated or Divorced — 2. a b c d

3. Age:
   (a) 20 - 24 (e) 40 - 44
   (b) 25 - 29 (f) 45 - 49
   (c) 30 - 34 (g) 50 - 54
   (d) 35 - 39 (h) 55 - 59
   (i) 60 or over — 3. a b c d e f g h i

4. Highest level of education attained:
   (a) Three years of university or less
   (b) Bachelor of Education degree
   (c) Bachelor's degree and a teaching diploma
   (d) Two bachelor's degrees
   (e) Master's degree
   (f) Doctorate — 4. a b c d e f

5. Preparation:
   (a) Major in foreign language(s) within the field of education
   (b) Major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education
   (c) Non-major in foreign language(s) within the field of education
   (d) Non-major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education. — 5. a b c d

6. Total years of teaching experience:
   (a) 1 - 4 (c) 10 - 14 (e) 20 - 24
   (b) 5 - 9 (d) 15 - 19 (f) 25 or more — 6. a b c d e f

7. Number of years of teaching in present school:
   (a) 1 - 4 (c) 10 - 14 (e) 20 - 24
   (b) 5 - 9 (d) 15 - 19 (f) 25 or more — 7. a b c d e f

8. Present teaching level:
   (a) Elementary (d) Elementary - Junior High
   (b) Junior High (e) Junior - Senior High
   (c) Senior High (f) Elementary - Junior - Senior High — 8. a b c d e f

9. Other than as a classroom teacher, do you hold any administrative positions? 9. a b c d
   (a) No
   (b) Yes, as department head
   (c) Yes, as vice-principal
   (d) Yes, as principal

10. Foreign language(s) taught: 10. a b c d
   (a) French
   (b) German
   (c) Ukrainian
   (d) Other
   (e) Combination of the above

11. Indicate the main program you are using in each language area: 11. _____

12. Other than foreign languages, how many subjects do you teach? 12. a b c d e
   (a) None (c) Two (e) More
   (b) One (d) Three

13. Size of school population: 13. a b c d e
   (a) Less than 200 (d) 600 - 1000
   (b) 200 - 399 (e) over 1000
   (c) 400 - 599

14. Number of colleagues teaching foreign languages in your school: 14. a b c d e
   (a) None (c) Two
   (b) One (d) Three to five
   (e) More than five

15. Size of community in which you teach: 15. a b c d e f
   (a) Less than 5000 (d) 25,001-50,000
   (b) 5000 - 10,000 (e) 50,001-100,000
   (c) 10,001-25,000 (f) over 100,000

16. Average number of students in each of your foreign language classes: 16. a b c d e f
   (a) Less than 15 (d) 25 - 29
   (b) 15 - 19 (e) 30 - 34
   (c) 20 - 24 (f) 35 or more

17. Are you a member of any of these organizations?
(a) Alberta Modern Language Council
(b) Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers
(c) L'Association Canadienne-Française de L'Alberta
(d) L'Alliance Française
(e) German, Ukrainian, or other ethnic organization(s)

17. a b c d e

18. Are your foreign language classes semestered?
(a) Yes (b) No

18. a b

19. Is the foreign language which you teach your mother tongue?
(a) Yes (b) No

19. a b

20. Have you served on any committees or had other input into the present provincial curriculum?
(a) Yes (b) No

20. a b

PART II

Instructions: The following statements concern aspects of the teacher's job which are related to curriculum. We want to know how you feel about these aspects. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate reply.

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	The goals and objectives of the provincial curriculum are feasible and attainable.	1.	a	b	c	d	e
2.	The current methods used to evaluate foreign language teachers are effective and fair.	2.	a	b	c	d	e
3.	My role in curriculum development and the expectations held of me are fairly clear.	3.	a	b	c	d	e
4.	There is enough freedom in my school system to use a combination of methods and texts if I so desire.	4.	a	b	c	d	e
5.	Because of their professional knowledge, foreign language teachers generally have enough authority over the curriculum to meet the demands made of them.	5.	a	b	c	d	e
6.	The amount of preparation, correction, record-keeping and clerical duties hinders the effective operation of the teacher in carrying out his program.	6.	a	b	c	d	e
7.	External examinations administered to my foreign language classes are well-constructed, meaningful and fair.	7.	a	b	c	d	e
8.	The demand placed on the teacher to do curriculum work interferes with being an effective classroom teacher.	8.	a	b	c	d	e
9.	The extra-curricular duties required of teachers impede them from paying adequate attention to instructional needs.	9.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10.	Professional organizations and publications are beneficial to foreign language teachers.	10.	a	b	c	d	e
11.	I would prefer to play a greater role in the development of foreign language curriculum at the provincial level.	11.	a	b	c	d	e
12.	I am well able to select and adapt curricula for implementation in the classroom.	12.	a	b	c	d	e
13.	Adequate provisions for professional upgrading exist in my school system.	13.	a	b	c	d	e
14.	In my school and school system there is adequate recognition for the effective designing and implementing of a program.	14.	a	b	c	d	e
15.	The administration generally holds the same expectations of me as I hold for myself.	15.	a	b	c	d	e
16.	The socio-economic status of my school requires that I make many accommodations in the preparation of my foreign language program.	16.	a	b	c	d	e
17.	Comments, criticisms, and other student feedback are helpful as guides to revising teaching methods and programs.	17.	a	b	c	d	e
18.	I would prefer teaching in a subject area other than foreign languages.	18.	a	b	c	d	e
19.	My supervisors stress too much adherence to the provincial curriculum and authorized textual materials, with too much concern for complete coverage of the material.	19.	a	b	c	d	e
20.	The administration of my school and school system are supportive of the foreign language program.	20.	a	b	c	d	e

			a Strongly agree	b Agree	c Undecided or neutral	d Disagree	e Strongly disagree
21.	Teachers' needs and preferences are adequately taken into account in setting and modifying the provincial curriculum and programs in my school system.	21.	a	b	c	d	e
22.	My school system provides personnel (administrators or consultants) who are available to handle problems encountered with the foreign language program.	22.	a	b	c	d	e
23.	I would enjoy taking additional training in foreign language curriculum and methodology.	23.	a	b	c	d	e
24.	Most pupils entering my classes have sufficient ability to handle the foreign language program as prescribed by the course of studies.	24.	a	b	c	d	e
25.	The amount of feedback which I receive from supervisors is adequate to allow me to know that I am doing a good job or to make any required changes.	25.	a	b	c	d	e
26.	Most innovations made to the provincial curriculum are feasible and capable of being directly implemented in my foreign language classes.	26.	a	b	c	d	e
27.	Teachers generally do not have sufficient say in the establishing of broad outlines for instructional programs.	27.	a	b	c	d	e
28.	Teachers are relatively free to select subject matter for the foreign language classes which they teach.	28.	a	b	c	d	e
29.	I am generally free to organize and sequence the detailed content of my foreign language classes.	29.	a	b	c	d	e
30.	The provincial curriculum is sufficiently adaptable to meet student needs.	30.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
31.	My students have high expectations of the foreign language program.	31.	a	b	c	d	e
32.	I am satisfied with the amount of contact that I have with other foreign language teachers, professional curriculum workers, and university personnel.	32.	a	b	c	d	e
33.	My out-of-school experiences (such as overseas travel or membership in ethnic organizations) are valuable in preparing an effective foreign language program.	33.	a	b	c	d	e
34.	Individual teacher innovations are frowned upon in my school and school system.	34.	a	b	c	d	e
35.	It is difficult to arrange the participation of native speakers to take part in my foreign language program.	35.	a	b	c	d	e
36.	Teachers are relatively free to select teaching methods they will use in their foreign language classes.	36.	a	b	c	d	e
37.	The supervision of foreign language teachers is generally competent, helpful, and stimulating.	37.	a	b	c	d	e
38.	My colleagues and the administration respect my competence as a foreign language teacher.	38.	a	b	c	d	e
39.	Fair and adequate funding exists for foreign language programs.	39.	a	b	c	d	e
40.	The provincial curriculum and the program that I am following are fairly straight-forward and clear.	40.	a	b	c	d	e

			a Strongly agree	b Agree	c Undecided or neutral	d Disagree	e Strongly disagree
41.	An adequate number of useful in-service programs are conducted for foreign language teachers.	41.	a	b	c	d	e
42.	Most innovations introduced in foreign language curricula are clearly explained.	42.	a	b	c	d	e
43.	The values of the provincial curriculum are generally the same as my own.	43.	a	b	c	d	e
44.	I am satisfied with the grade level(s) which I am teaching.	44.	a	b	c	d	e
45.	The role played by politics has hindered the development of effective foreign language programs.	45.	a	b	c	d	e
46.	Teachers are given the freedom to incorporate their normal teaching style (whether lecturing, participative, child-centered, or subject-centered) into their foreign language program.	46.	a	b	c	d	e
47.	The curriculum and methods courses that I have taken at university have provided me with adequate preparation for doing curriculum work in foreign languages.	47.	a	b	c	d	e
48.	I have a reasonable input into the decision concerning the choice of text(s) that I use.	48.	a	b	c	d	e
49.	Due to situational and cultural differences, it is unlikely that foreign language achievement in this province will reach European standards.	49.	a	b	c	d	e
50.	I am satisfied with the program which I am presently teaching.	50.	a	b	c	d	e
51.	It is difficult to find suitable materials for teaching foreign languages.	51.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
52.	The range of student abilities within my classes makes it difficult to plan an effective program.	52.	a	b	c	d	e
53.	I would prefer to play a greater role in the development of foreign language curricula in my school system.	53.	a	b	c	d	e
54.	There is adequate time for lesson preparation and curriculum work during the school day.	54.	a	b	c	d	e
55.	Foreign languages are regarded as an important part of the total curriculum by my colleagues and administration.	55.	a	b	c	d	e
56.	Most innovations made by the province in foreign language curriculum are necessary.	56.	a	b	c	d	e
57.	I would prefer to see a more highly structured provincial curriculum.	57.	a	b	c	d	e
58.	Teachers are relatively free to select teaching materials for their foreign language programs.	58.	a	b	c	d	e
59.	The community in which I teach understands and values the importance of the foreign language(s) that I teach.	59.	a	b	c	d	e
60.	Class size is a factor which poses many problems for the preparation and implementation of my foreign language program.	60.	a	b	c	d	e
61.	Teachers have sufficient input into the determination, development, and implementation of innovations to the foreign language curriculum.	61.	a	b	c	d	e
62.	There are sufficient supplemental materials (audiovisual resources, library books, workbooks) available to effectively carry out the foreign language program in my school.	62.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
63.	I would enjoy taking additional language training in the foreign language which I am teaching.	63.	a	b	c	d	e
64.	In my school system, improvement needs to be made in the on-going review and revision of the foreign language program by a fixed committee.	64.	a	b	c	d	e
65.	I would like to see the introduction of more changes to the foreign language curriculum.	65.	a	b	c	d	e

PART III

Instructions: Some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. We want to know how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate reply.

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	My job is like a hobby to me.	1.	a	b	c	d	e
2.	My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored	2.	a	b	c	d	e
3.	It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.	3.	a	b	c	d	e
4.	I consider my job rather pleasant.	4.	a	b	c	d	e
5.	I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.	5.	a	b	c	d	e
6.	I am often bored with my job.	6.	a	b	c	d	e
7.	I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.	7.	a	b	c	d	e
8.	Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.	8.	a	b	c	d	e
9.	I am satisfied with my job for the time being.	9.	a	b	c	d	e
10.	I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.	10.	a	b	c	d	e
11.	I definitely dislike my work.	11.	a	b	c	d	e
12.	I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.	12.	a	b	c	d	e
13.	Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	13.	a	b	c	d	e
14.	Each day of work seems like it will never end.	14.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
15.	I like my job better than the average worker does.	15.	a	b	c	d	e
16.	My job is pretty uninteresting.	16.	a	b	c	d	e
17.	I find real enjoyment in my work.	17.	a	b	c	d	e
18.	I am disappointed that I ever took this job.	18.	a	b	c	d	e
19.	What is your overall level of satisfaction with your job? (a) Very satisfied (b) Satisfied (c) Undecided (d) Dissatisfied (e) Very dissatisfied	19.	a	b	c	d	e
20.	How do you feel about changing your job? (a) I do not want to change jobs, even for more money, as this is a good one. (b) This job is as good as the average. I would just as soon have it as another. (c) I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do. (d) I am not eager to change jobs, but would do so if I could make more money. (e) I would take almost any other job (either teaching or non-teaching) in which I could earn as much as I am now earning.	20.	a	b	c	d	e

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL
FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES DE L'ÉDUCATION
CITÉ UNIVERSITAIRE
QUEBEC 10, CANADA
G1K 7P4

10 March, 1980.

Dear Colleague,

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a research project being conducted at Université Laval, Québec. The purposes of the study are:

(a) to determine the level of job satisfaction among the second language teachers of Alberta;

(b) to explore their perceptions of certain curricular variables which influence them in their work; and

(c) to examine any correlations which may exist between such curricular variables and job satisfaction.

My interest in this area stems from having taught French as a second language for eight years with the Medicine Hat School Division #4. I am presently on a leave of absence and completing graduate work in the area of second language curriculum.

Even though some of the questionnaire items may seem repetitious, your cooperation in completing all items and all sections will be greatly appreciated. Please be assured that all replies will remain strictly confidential, being used simply as project data.

A prompt return would be most helpful. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Yours truly

P. Nederveen

Paul Nederveen
Box 11,
Irvine, Alberta
TOJ 1V0

p.s. If you choose to not complete the questionnaire, a return indicating the reason would still be appreciated.

TAP

APPENDIX C

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

AND

CURRICULAR VARIABLES

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR

MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Notes: This questionnaire is intended for teachers of foreign languages who are engaged in such instruction for one-third or more of their teaching time.

The questionnaire comprises three sections and a total of 105 questions.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated.

PART I

Instructions: The following items concern personal and demographic variables. Please circle the letter of the appropriate response for each item.

1. Sex: (1. a b)
   (a) Male (b) Female

2. Marital Status: (2. a b c d)
   (a) Single (c) Widow(er)
   (b) Married (d) Separated or Divorced

3. Age: (3. a b c d e f g h i)
   (a) 20 - 24 (e) 40 - 44
   (b) 25 - 29 (f) 45 - 49
   (c) 30 - 34 (g) 50 - 54
   (d) 35 - 39 (h) 55 - 59
   (i) 60 or over

4. Highest level of education attained: (4. a b c d e f)
   (a) Three years of university or less
   (b) Bachelor of Education degree
   (c) Bachelor's degree and a teaching diploma
   (d) Two bachelor's degrees
   (e) Master's degree
   (f) Doctorate

5. Preparation: (5. a b c d e)
   (a) Major in foreign language(s) within the field of education
   (b) Major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education
   (c) Non-major in foreign language(s) within the field of education
   (d) Non-major in foreign language(s) outside the field of education

6. Total years of teaching experience: (6. a b c d e f)
   (a) 0 - 4 (c) 10 - 14 (e) 20 - 24
   (b) 5 - 9 (d) 15 - 19 (f) 25 or more

7. Number of years of teaching in present school: (7. a b c d e f)
   (a) 0 - 4 (c) 10 - 14 (e) 20 - 24
   (b) 5 - 9 (d) 15 - 19 (f) 25 or more

8. Present teaching level: (8. a b c d e f)
   (a) Elementary (d) Elementary - Junior High
   (b) Junior High (e) Junior - Senior High
   (c) Senior High (f) Elementary - Junior - Senior High

9. Other than as a classroom teacher, do you hold any administrative position?
   (a) No
   (b) Yes, as department head
   (c) Yes, as vice-principal or assistant principal
   (d) Yes, as principal

9. a b c d

10. Foreign language(s) taught:
   (a) French
   (b) German
   (c) Ukrainian
   (d) Other
   (e) Combination of the above

10. a b c d

11. Indicate the main program you are using in each language area:

11. _____

12. Other than foreign languages, how many subjects do you teach?
   (a) None (c) Two (e) More
   (b) One (d) Three

12. a b c d e

13. Size of school population:
   (a) Less than 200 (d) 600 - 1000
   (b) 200 - 399 (e) Over 1000
   (c) 400 - 599

13. a b c d e

14. Number of colleagues teaching foreign languages in your school:

14. a b c d e

15. Size of community in which you teach:
   (a) Less than 5000 (d) 25,001-50,000
   (b) 5000 - 10,000 (e) 50,001-100,000
   (c) 10,001-25,000 (f) over 100,000

15. a b c d e f

16. Average number of students in each of your foreign language classes:
   (a) Less than 15 (d) 25 - 29
   (b) 15 - 19 (e) 30 - 34
   (c) 20 - 24 (f) 35 or more

16. a b c d e

17. Are you a member of any of these organizations? 17. a b c d e
(a) Alberta Modern Language Council
(b) Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers
(c) L'Association Canadienne-Française de L'Alberta
(d) L'Alliance Française
(e) German, Ukrainian, or other ethnic organization(s)

18. Are your foreign language classes semestered? 18. a b
(a) Yes (b) No

19. Is the foreign language which you teach your mother tongue? 19. a b
(a) Yes (b) No

20. Have you served on any committees or had other input into the present provincial curriculum? 20. a b
(a) Yes (b) No

PART II

Instructions: The following statements concern aspects of the teacher's job which are related to curriculum. We want to know how you feel about these aspects. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate reply.

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	The goals and objectives of the provincial curriculum under which I am operating are feasible and attainable.	1.	a	b	c	d	e
2.	The current methods used by my school and school system to evaluate foreign language teachers are effective and fair.	2.	a	b	c	d	e
3.	My role in classroom curriculum development and the expectations held of me are clear.	3.	a	b	c	d	e
4.	There is enough freedom in my school system to use a combination of methods and texts if I so desire.	4.	a	b	c	d	e
5.	Because of their professional knowledge, foreign language teachers generally have enough authority over the curriculum to meet the demands made of them.	5.	a	b	c	d	e
6.	The amount of preparation, correction, record-keeping and clerical duties hinders the effective operation of the teacher in carrying out his program.	6.	a	b	c	d	e
7.	External examinations (e.g., benchmark tests, system-wide exams) administered to my foreign language classes are well-constructed, meaningful and fair.	7.	a	b	c	d	e
8.	The demand placed on the teacher to do curriculum work interferes with being an effective classroom teacher.	8.	a	b	c	d	e
9.	The extra-curricular duties required of teachers impede them from paying adequate attention to instructional needs.	9.	a	b	c	d	e

			a Strongly agree	b Agree	c Undecided or neutral	d Disagree	e Strongly disagree
10.	Professional organizations and publications are beneficial to foreign language teachers.	10.	a	b	c	d	e
11.	I would prefer to play a greater role in the development of foreign language curriculum at the provincial level.	11.	a	b	c	d	e
12.	I am well able to select and adapt curricula for implementation in the classroom.	12.	a	b	c	d	e
13.	Adequate provisions for professional upgrading exist in my school system.	13.	a	b	c	d	e
14.	In my school and school system there is adequate recognition for the effective designing and implementing of a program.	14.	a	b	c	d	e
15.	The administration generally holds the same expectations of me as I hold for myself.	15.	a	b	c	d	e
16.	The socio-economic status of my school requires that I make many accommodations in the preparation of my foreign language program.	16.	a	b	c	d	e
17.	Comments, criticisms, and other student feedback are helpful as guides to revising teaching methods and programs.	17.	a	b	c	d	e
18.	I would prefer teaching in a subject area other than foreign languages.	18.	a	b	c	d	e
19.	My supervisors stress too much adherence to the provincial curriculum and authorized textual materials, with too much concern for complete coverage of the material.	19.	a	b	c	d	e
20.	The administration of my school and school system are supportive of the foreign language program.	20.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
21.	Teachers' needs and preferences are adequately taken into account in setting and modifying the provincial curriculum and programs in my school system.	21.	a	b	c	d	e
22.	My school system provides personnel (e.g., administrators or consultants) who are available to handle problems encountered with the foreign language program.	22.	a	b	c	d	e
23.	I would enjoy taking additional training in foreign language curriculum and methodology.	23.	a	b	c	d	e
24.	Most pupils entering my classes have sufficient ability to handle the foreign language program as prescribed by the course of studies.	24.	a	b	c	d	e
25.	The amount of feedback which I receive from supervisors is adequate to allow me to know that I am doing a good job or to make any required changes.	25.	a	b	c	d	e
26.	Most innovations made to the provincial curriculum are feasible and capable of being directly implemented in my foreign language classes.	26.	a	b	c	d	e
27.	Teachers generally do not have sufficient say in the establishing of broad outlines for instructional programs.	27.	a	b	c	d	e
28.	I am relatively free to select subject matter for the foreign language classes which I teach.	28.	a	b	c	d	e
29.	I am generally free to organize and sequence the detailed content of my foreign language classes.	29.	a	b	c	d	e
30.	The provincial curriculum is sufficiently adaptable to meet variable student needs.	30.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
31.	My students have high expectations of the foreign language program.	31.	a	b	c	d	e
32.	I am satisfied with the amount of contact that I have with other foreign language teachers, professional curriculum workers, and university personnel.	32.	a	b	c	d	e
33.	My out-of-school experiences (such as overseas travel or membership in ethnic organizations) are valuable in preparing an effective foreign language program.	33.	a	b	c	d	e
34.	Individual teacher innovations are frowned upon in my school and school system.	34.	a	b	c	d	e
35.	It is difficult to arrange the participation of native speakers to take part in my foreign language program.	35.	a	b	c	d	e
36.	Teachers are relatively free to select teaching methods they will use in their foreign language classes.	36.	a	b	c	d	e
37.	The supervision of foreign language teachers is generally competent and helpful.	37.	a	b	c	d	e
38.	My colleagues and the administration respect my competence as a foreign language teacher.	38.	a	b	c	d	e
39.	Fair and adequate funding exists for foreign language programs.	39.	a	b	c	d	e
40.	The provincial curriculum and the program that I am following are fairly straight-forward and clear.	40.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
41.	An adequate number of useful in-service programs are conducted for foreign language teachers.	41.	a	b	c	d	e
42.	Most innovations introduced in foreign language curricula are clearly explained.	42.	a	b	c	d	e
43.	The values of the provincial curriculum are generally the same as my own.	43.	a	b	c	d	e
44.	I am satisfied with the grade level(s) which I am teaching.	44.	a	b	c	d	e
45.	The role played by politics has hindered the development of effective foreign language programs.	45.	a	b	c	d	e
46.	Teachers are given the freedom to incorporate their normal teaching style (whether lecturing, participative, child-centered, or subject-centered) into their foreign language program.	46.	a	b	c	d	e
47.	The curriculum and methods courses that I have taken at university have provided me with adequate preparation for doing curriculum work in foreign languages.	47.	a	b	c	d	e
48.	I have a reasonable input into the decision concerning the choice of text(s) that I use.	48.	a	b	c	d	e
49.	Due to situational and cultural differences, it is unlikely that foreign language achievement in this province will reach European standards.	49.	a	b	c	d	e
50.	I am satisfied with the program which I am presently teaching.	50.	a	b	c	d	e
51.	It is difficult to find suitable materials for teaching foreign languages.	51.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
52.	The range of student abilities within my classes makes it difficult to plan an effective program.	52.	a	b	c	d	e
53.	I would prefer to play a greater role in the development of foreign language curricula in my school system.	53.	a	b	c	d	e
54.	There is adequate time for lesson preparation and curriculum work during the school day.	54.	a	b	c	d	e
55.	Foreign languages are regarded as an important part of the total curriculum by my colleagues and administration.	55.	a	b	c	d	e
56.	Most innovations made by the province in foreign language curriculum are necessary.	56.	a	b	c	d	e
57.	I would prefer to see a more highly structured provincial curriculum.	57.	a	b	c	d	e
58.	Teachers are relatively free to select teaching materials for their foreign language programs.	58.	a	b	c	d	e
59.	The community in which I teach understands and values the importance of the foreign language(s) that I teach.	59.	a	b	c	d	e
60.	Class size is a factor which poses many problems for the preparation and implementation of my foreign language program.	60.	a	b	c	d	e
61.	Teachers have sufficient input into the determination, development, and implementation of innovations to the foreign language curriculum.	61.	a	b	c	d	e
62.	There are sufficient supplemental materials (audiovisual resources, library books, workbooks) available to effectively carry out the foreign language program in my school.	62.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
63.	I would enjoy taking additional language training in the foreign language which I am teaching.	63.	a	b	c	d	e
64.	In my school system, improvement needs to be made in the on-going review and revision of the foreign language program by a fixed committee.	64.	a	b	c	d	e
65.	I would like to see the introduction of more changes to the foreign language curriculum.	65.	a	b	c	d	e

If you perceive any other influences relating to curriculum which facilitate or impede your work with foreign language classes, please comment.

PART III

Instructions: Some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. We want to know how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate your opinion by circling the appropriate reply.

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	My job is like a hobby to me.	1.	a	b	c	d	e
2.	My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored	2.	a	b	c	d	e
3.	It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.	3.	a	b	c	d	e
4.	I consider my job rather pleasant.	4.	a	b	c	d	e
5.	I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.	5.	a	b	c	d	e
6.	I am often bored with my job.	6.	a	b	c	d	e
7.	I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.	7.	a	b	c	d	e
8.	Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.	8.	a	b	c	d	e
9.	I am satisfied with my job for the time being.	9.	a	b	c	d	e
10.	I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.	10.	a	b	c	d	e
11.	I definitely dislike my work.	11.	a	b	c	d	e
12.	I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.	12.	a	b	c	d	e
13.	Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	13.	a	b	c	d	e
14.	Each day of work seems like it will never end.	14.	a	b	c	d	e

			Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided or neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
15.	I like my job better than the average worker does.	15.	a	b	c	d	e
16.	My job is pretty uninteresting.	16.	a	b	c	d	e
17.	I find real enjoyment in my work.	17.	a	b	c	d	e
18.	I am disappointed that I ever took this job.	18.	a	b	c	d	e
19.	What is your overall level of satisfaction with your job? (a) Very satisfied (b) Satisfied (c) Undecided (d) Dissatisfied (e) Very dissatisfied	19.	a	b	c	d	e
20.	How do you feel about changing your job? (a) I do not want to change jobs, even for more money, as this is a good one. (b) This job is as good as the average. I would just as soon have it as another. (c) I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do. (d) I am not eager to change jobs, but would do so if I could make more money. (e) I would take almost any other job (either teaching or non-teaching) in which I could earn as much as I am now earning.	20.	a	b	c	d	e

APPENDIX D

CODING AND WEIGHTING KEY

PART I

Items were coded and analysed according to the choices provided in the questionnaire with the following exceptions:

11. Indicate the main program you are using in each language area:

(a) Voix et Images de France
(b) Ecouter et parler
(c) Le Français International
(d) J'écoute; je parle
(e) Passeport Français
(f) A combination of French programs including Le Français International
(g) A combination of French programs not including Le Français International
(h) Other French program
(i) German, Ukrainian, or a combination of programs for different languages

14. Number of colleagues teaching foreign languages in your school: The following categories were coded only when supplied by the respondent since the original questionnaire omitted to provide the choices.

(a) None
(b) One
(c) Two
(d) Three
(e) Four or more

17. Are you a member of any of these organizations?

(a) Alberta Modern Language Council
(b) Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers
(c) L'Association Canadienne-Française de l'Alberta
(d) L'Alliance Française
(e) German, Ukrainian, or other ethnic organization(s)
(f) Both (a) and (b)
(g) Two of (c), (d), or (e)
(h) One of (a) or (b), and one of (c), (d), or (e)
(i) Three or more organizations

18. Are your foreign language classes semestered?

(a) Yes
(b) No
(c) Some classes semestered, others not semestered

PART II

Items coded as positive (+) were weighted as follows:

strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Undecided or neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

Items coded as negative (-) were weighted as follows:

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Undecided or neutral	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5

1.	+	21.	+	41.	+	61.	+
2.	+	22.	+	42.	+	62.	+
3.	+	23.	+	43.	+	63.	+
4.	+	24.	+	44.	+	64.	-
5.	+	25.	-	45.	-	65.	-
6.	-	26.	+	46.	+		
7.	+	27.	-	47.	+		
8.	-	28.	+	48.	+		
9.	-	29.	+	49.	-		
10.	+	30.	+	50.	+		
11.	-	31.	+	51.	-		
12.	+	32.	+	52.	-		
13.	+	33.	+	53.	-		
14.	+	34.	-	54.	+		
15.	+	35.	-	55.	+		
16.	-	36.	+	56.	+		
17.	+	37.	+	57.	-		
18.	-	38.	+	58.	+		
19.	-	39.	+	59.	+		
20.	+	40.	+	60.	-		

PART III

Items worded positively (+) were weighted as follows:

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Undecided or neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

Items worded negatively (-) were weighted as follows:

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Undecided or neutral	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5

1.	+	11.	-
2.	+	12.	+
3.	-	13.	+
4.	+	14.	-
5.	+	15.	+
6.	-	16.	-
7.	+	17.	+
8.	-	18.	-
9.	+	19.	+
10.	-		

The behavioral question (Item 20) was weighted as follows:

20. How do you feel about changing your job?

5	(a)	I do not want to change jobs, even for more money as this is a good one.
4	(b)	This job is as good as the average. I would just as soon have it as another.
1	(c)	I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do.
3	(d)	I am not eager to change jobs, but would do so if I could make more money.
2	(e)	I would take almost any other job (either teaching or non-teaching) in which I could earn as much as I am now earning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aikenhead, J.D., "Teacher Satisfactions and Discouragements," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Volume 6, Number 2, June, 1960, pp. 92-102.

Alderfer, C.P., "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Volume 4, Number 2, May, 1969.

Allen, D.I.; Hamelin, R; Nixon, G., "Need for Structure, Program Openness, and Job Satisfaction in Open-Area and Self-Contained Classrooms," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Volume 22, Number 2, June, 1976, pp. 149-153.

Anderson, L.W., "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 46, Number 9, May, 1953, pp. 693-698.

Andrisani, P.J., Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.

Aspy, D.N., "An Investigation into the Relationship Between Teachers' Factual Knowledge of Learning Theory and Their Classroom Performance," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume 23, Number 1, Spring, 1972, pp. 21-24.

Banning, E.I., "Teacher Attitudes Toward Curriculum Change: The Effects of Personal Relationships on the Degree of Favourableness," Journal of Experimental Education, Volume 23, Number 2, December, 1954, pp. 133-147.

Barrett, T.C., Relationship Between Perceived Faculty Participation in the Decision-Making Process and Job Satisfaction in the Community Colleges of North Carolina, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1969.

Beauchamp, G.A., Planning the Elementary School Curriculum, Boston, Allyn-Bacon, 1956.

Beecher, C., "Curriculum Practices: Their Effect and/or Relationship to Selected Biographical and Professional Variables," Journal of Experimental Education, Volume 46, Number 2, Winter, 1978, pp. 31-41.

Belasco, J.A.; Alutto, J.A., "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administrator's Quarterly, Volume 8, Number 1, Winter, 1972, pp. 44-58.

Benne, K.D.; Muntyan, Bozidar, Human Relations in Curriculum Change, New York, Dryden Press, 1951.

Bjork, W.E., A Study of the Influence of the Role of the Curriculum Consultant on Curriculum Implementation, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1970.

Blanton, M.E.; Uffelman, G.W., High School Teacher Perceptions of Innovative Concepts, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Southern California, 1978.

Bohrnstedt, G.W., "A Methodological Note Comparing the Questionnaire and the Interview," Journal of Psychological Studies, Volume 15, Number 1, March, 1967, pp. 29-38.

Bolam, R., "The Types of Environment Most Likely to Favour the Active and Effective Participation of Teachers in Educational Innovation," in: Teachers as Innovators, monograph of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris, 1976.

Brayfield, A.H.; Rothe, H.F., "An Instrument of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 35, Number 5, October, 1951.

Bridges, E.M., "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making," Administrator's Notebook, Volume 12, Number 9, May, 1964.

Brophy, J.E., "Achievement Correlates," in: Evaluating Educational Performance, Berkeley, California, McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974, pp. 33-46.

Brophy, J.E.; Good, T.L., Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Brown, M.B.; W.J. Dixon, B.M.D.P. Biomedical Computer Programs, P. Series, Los Angeles, Health Sciences Computing Facility, University of California, 1977.

Burns, E.J., The Emerging Role of the Teacher in Curriculum Policy Formation and Decision-Making in the State of New Jersey, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Fordham University, 1970.

Burstall, C., "French in the Primary School: Some Early Findings," Journal of Curriculum Studies, Volume 2, Number 1, May, 1970, pp. 48-58.

Bush, R.N., The Teacher-Pupil Relationship, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1954.

Butler, T.M., "Satisfactions of Beginning Teachers," Clearing House, Volume 36, Number 1, September, 1961, pp. 11-13.

Campbell, M.V., "Teacher-Principal Agreement on the Teacher Role," Administrator's Notebook, Volume 7, Number 6, February, 1959, pp. 1-4.

Cay, D.F., Curriculum: Design for Learning, New York, Bobbs Merrill Company, 1966.

Chase, F.S., "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 33, Number 3, November, 1951, pp. 127-132.

Chase, F.S., "Professional Leadership and Teacher Morale," Administrator's Notebook, Volume 1, Number 8, March, 1953, pp. 1-4.

Clark, C.; Yinger, R.J., "Research on Teacher Thinking," Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 7, Number 4, Winter, 1977, pp. 279-304.

Clarke, G.A., Teachers' Perceptions of School Decision-Making Roles, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.

Coffman, W.E., "Teacher Morale and Curriculum Development: A Statistical Analysis of Responses to a Reaction Inventory," Journal of Experimental Education, Volume 19, Number 4, June, 1951, pp. 305-332.

Connelly, F.M., "Curriculum Decision-Making by Teachers," Canadian Society for the Study of Education Bulletin, Volume 2, Number 1, January, 1975, pp. 1-5.

Conroy, J.P., The Effect on the Job Descriptive Index Used for Measuring Teacher Job Satisfaction When a Student Area is Added, unpublished Ed. D. thesis, University of Denver, 1979.

Corriveau, R.L., A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual and Preferred Degree of Teacher Participation in a Number of Decisions, unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

Corwin, R.G., "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, Volume 38, Number 4, Summer, 1965, pp. 310-331.

Dangharn, N., An Investigation of Teacher Innovation and Attitude Toward Participation in Curriculum Planning and Use, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1978.

Defazio, R.J., A Study of the Relationships Among Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Militancy, and School District Conflict, unpublished Ed. D. thesis, Syracuse University, 1978.

de Garcia, R.; Reynolds, S.; Savignon, S.J., "Foreign Language Attitude Survey," The Canadian Modern Language Review, Volume 32, Number 3, February, 1976, pp. 302-304.

de Garcia, R.; Reynolds, S., "Foreign Language Teachers' Attitudes: A Strategy for Exploration and Change," Foreign Language Annals, Volume 10, Number 6, December, 1977, pp. 649-655.

Devlin, B.S., Teacher Participation in Decision-Making and its Relationship to the Variables, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Job Tension, and Attitudinal Militancy, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1978.

Diemert, N.E., Teacher Satisfaction in Team and Conventional Teaching Situations, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

Diemert, N.E.; Holdaway, E.A., "Teacher Satisfaction in Team and Conventional Teaching Situations," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Volume 16, Number 2, June, 1970, pp. 111-122.

Elashoff, J.D.; Snow, R.E., Pygmalion Reconsidered, Worthington, Ohio, Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1971.

Elmquist, A.M., "The Foreign Language Teacher: Background and Attitudes," Foreign Language Annals, Volume 6, Number 4, May, 1973, pp. 490-499.

Emans, R., "Teacher Attitudes as a Function of Values," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 62, Number 10, July/August, 1969, pp. 459-463.

Ewen, R.B., "Weighting Components of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 51, Number 1, February, 1967, pp. 68-73.

Fast, R.G., Leader Behavior of Principals as it Relates to Teacher Satisfaction, unpublished M. Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

Francoeur, K., Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

Freedle, S.D., An Exploration of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Selected Activities in Organized Curriculum Improvement, unpublished D.Ed. thesis, University of Tennessee 1971.

Fullan, M.; Pomfret, A., "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation," Review of Educational Research, Volume 47, Number 2, Winter, 1977, pp. 335-397.

Gabel, D.; Rubba, P., "Attitude Changes of Elementary Teachers According to the Curriculum Studied During Workshop Participation and their Role as Model Science Teachers," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Volume 16, Number 1, January, 1979, pp. 19-24.

Gardner, R.M., Curriculum Planning Needs of Teachers, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971.

Getzels, J.W.; Guba, E.G., "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, Volume 29, Number 1, September, 1955, pp. 30-40.

Giandomenico, L.L., "Teacher Needs, Militancy, and the Scope of Collective Bargaining," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 66, Number 6, February, 1973, pp. 257-259.

Gosine, M.; Keith, M.V., "Bureaucracy, Teacher Personality Needs and Teacher Satisfaction," The Canadian Administrator, Volume 10, Number 1, October, 1970, pp. 1-5.

Gunter, M.A., The Process of Curriculum Decision-Making in the Intermediate Schools of Charlottesville, Virginia, unpublished Ed. D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1978.

Hadaway, F.J., Selected Personal Characteristics Related to Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Teachers, unpublished Ed. D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

Haller, E.J., Strategies for Change (Monograph), Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Department of Educational Administration), 1969.

Hawley, G.B., Actual and Preferred Levels of Curriculum Decision-Making as Perceived by Selected Groups, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

Hazer, J.T., "Job Satisfaction: A Possible Integration of Two Theories," Training and Development Journal, Vol-30, Number 7, July, 1976, pp. 12-14.

Henderson, L.F., Elementary Teacher Satisfaction and Morale and Perceived Participation in Decision-Making," unpublished Ed. D. thesis, University of Arkansas, 1976.

Hennessy, P.H., Teacher Militancy: A Comparative Study of Ontario, Quebec, and New York Teachers, 1975 (Monograph) Ottawa, Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1975.

Henry, G.H., "Style of Teaching and Teacher Evaluations," English Journal, Volume 59, Number 7, October, 1970, pp. 921-927.

Herron, M., "On Teacher Perception and Curricular Innovation," Curriculum Thory Network, Number 7, 1971, pp. 47-52.

Hersom, N., "Coping with the Changing Curriculum," Elements: Translating Theory into Practice, Volume 6, Number 2, October, 1974, pp. 4-5.

Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B.; Snyderman, B.B., The Motivation to Work, New York, Wiley, 1959.

Hewitson, M.T., The Professional Satisfaction of Beginning Teachers, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1975.

Holdaway, E.A., Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report (Satisfaction of Teachers in Alberta with their Work and Working Conditions: Report of a Study), University of Alberta, 1978.

Hoppock, R., Job Satisfaction, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935.

Hounshell, P.B.; Dieter, D.L., "The Self Image of Outstanding Biology Teachers," School Sciences and Mathematics, Number 75, March, 1975, pp. 284-287.

Houston, J.G., "The Effects of Verbal Style in Teaching Physics," Physics Education, Volume 10, Number 1, January, 1975, pp. 38-40.

Huenecke, D., "Knowledge of Curriculum Works: Its Relation to Teaching Practice," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter, 1970, pp. 478-485.

Iris, B.; Barrett, G., "Some Relations Between Job and Life Satisfaction and Job Importance," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 56, Number 4, 1972, pp. 301-304.

Jeffares, D., A Descriptive Study of Teacher Decisions in Curriculum Development, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1973.

Johansen, J.H., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Authoritative Influence in Local Curriculum Decision-Making and Curriculum Implementation," Journal of Educational Research, Volume 61, Number 2, October, 1967, pp. 81-83.

Johnson, B.K., An Examination of Some Relationships Between Teacher Satisfaction and the Socio-Economic Status of Schools, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

Johnston, G.S.; Yeakey, C.C., "Administrators' and Teachers' Preferences for Staff Development," Planning and Change, Volume 8, Number 4, Winter, 1977, pp. 230-238.

Justice, B.F., The Impact of Selected Structural Characteristics of Schools Upon Teacher Response to Innovative Social Studies Curricula, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), 1978.

Karolat, H.G., Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Comprehensive Schools in Saskatchewan, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Keith, P.M., "Administrative and Faculty Turnover and Diffusion of an Educational Innovation," Urban Education, Volume 10, Number 3, October, 1975, pp. 297-304.

Kendall, M.G.; Smith, B.B., "Randomness and Random Sampling Numbers," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Number 101, 1938.

Kerman, S., "Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement," Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 60, Number 10, June, 1979, pp. 716-718.

Knoop, R.; O'Reilly, R., Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organizational Effectiveness of Elementary Schools, paper presented to the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration Conference, Laval University, Quebec City, June, 3, 1976.

Kunin, T., "The Construction of a New Type of Attitude Measure," Personnel Psychology, Volume 8, 1955, pp. 65-77.

Lacy, A. An Analysis of Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction of Public High School Business Education Teachers in Ohio, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University, 1968.

Lacy, A., "Teacher Job Satisfaction: Factors and Implications," Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Volume 15, Number 4, August, 1973, pp. 24-30.

Lamont, A.H., The Effect of Teacher Participation in Preparing Curriculum Materials on Subsequent Use of the Materials, unpublished Ed. D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1964.

Langenback, M., Development of an Instrument to Measure Teachers' Attitudes Toward Curriculum Use and Planning, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1969.

Lazarowitz, R., "Does Use of Curriculum Change Teachers' Attitude Toward Inquiry?". Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Volume 13, Number 6, November, 1976, pp. 547-552.

Litwin, G.H.; Stringer, R.A. Jr., Motivation and Organizational Climate, Harvard University, Boston, 1968.

Locke, E.A., "What is Job Satisfaction?". Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Volume 4, Number 4, November, 1969, pp. 309-336.

Lofquist, L.H.; Dawis, R.V., Adjustment to Work, New York, Appleton - Century - Crofts, 1969.

MacDonald, B.; Rudduck, J., "Curriculum Research and Development Projects: Barriers to Success," British Journal of Educational Psychology, Volume 41, Number 2, June, 1971, pp. 148-154.

Mallula, S.A., Teacher Competency, Teacher Attitude and Student Attitude Toward Reading, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Georgia, 1978.

Martin, M.D., The Teacher in Cooperative Curriculum Development, unpublished D.Ed. thesis, University of Southern California, 1965.

Masajan, J.K., College Students' Achievement as a Function of the Congruence Between Their Beliefs and Their Instructors' Beliefs, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1972.

Maslow, A.H., "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review, Volume 50, Number 4, 1943, pp. 370-396.

Massé, D., Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

Mawter, P.T., Teacher Professionalism and Decision-Making Modes in Selected Elementary Schools as Determinant of Job Satisfaction, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Oregon, 1975.

Mayo, E., The Human Problems of an Industrial Society, New York, MacMillan Company, 1933.

Max, R.H., Teacher Attitudes Toward Bureaucracy, Professionalism, and Militancy, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, 1978.

McClusky, H.Y.; Strayer, F.J., "Reactions of Teachers to the Teaching Situation: A Study of Job Satisfaction," The School Review, Volume 48, Number 8, October, 1940, pp. 612-623.

McGuire, G.K., The Effect on Student Achievement of Teacher Participation in Curriculum Planning, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Chicago, 1959.

McKeatchie, W.T., "Motivation, Teaching Methods, and College Learning," paper in: Current Theory and Research in Motivation, Volume IX: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1961, pp. 111-142.

McKeown, R., "The Teacher's Role: The Fallacies of Academic Freedom and Professional Rights," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Volume 60, Number 399, April, 1976, pp. 57-61.

McLaughlin, J.W.; Shea, J.T., "California Teachers' Job Dissatisfactions," California Journal of Educational Research, Volume 11, Number 5, November, 1960, pp. 216-224.

Meyers, J.; Freidman, M.P.; Gangham, E.J., "The Effects of Consultee-Centered Consultation on Teacher Behavior," Psychology in the Schools, Volume 12, Number 3, July, 1975, pp. 288-295.

Mikes, P.S.; Hulin, C.L., "Use of Importance as a Weighting Component of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 52, Number 5, October, 1968, pp. 394-398.

Miklos, E., "Increasing Participation in Decision-Making," The Canadian Administrator, Volume 9, Number 6, March, 1970, pp. 25-29.

Miskel, C.; Glasnapp, D.; Hatley, R., "A Test of the Inequity Theory for Job Satisfaction Using Educators' Attitudes to Work Motivation and Work Incentives," Educational Administrators' Quarterly, Volume 11, Number 1, Winter, 1975, pp. 38-54.

Mobley, W.H.; Locke, E.A., "The Relationship of Value Importance to Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Volume 5, Number 5, September, 1970, pp. 463-483.

Morris, J.D., "Personality and Student Teaching Success," Journal of Experimental Education, Volume 43, Number 4, Summer, 1975, pp. 15-20.

Mumford, E., Job Satisfaction: A Study of Computer Specialists, Longman, London, 1972.

Murnane, R.J.; Phillips, B.R., "The School as a Workplace: What Matters to Teachers." Mathematics Policy Research and the University of Pennsylvania, 1977.

Nault, W.H., "Can Curriculum Guides be Effective?". Educational Leadership, Volume 12, Number 7, April, 1955. pp. 410-414.

Newton, E.E., Teacher Reaction to Change, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 1967.

Newton, E.E.; Housego, I.E., "Teacher Reaction to Change: A Case Study," The Canadian Administrator, Volume 6, Number 7, April, 1967, pp. 25-28.

Noad, B.M., An Exploration of Relationships Among Self-Concept, Educational Attitudes, Motivation, and Reported Competencies of Elementary Student Teachers, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Houston, 1978.

Oberg, A.A., Information Referents and Patterns in the Curriculum Planning of Classroom Teachers, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, Fall, 1975.

Okonkwa, A.E.N., A Study of Teachers' Attitudes and Their Relation to Work Satisfaction, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

O'Reilly, R.R., A Study of Teacher Attitudes Concerning Standardized Practices in Instructional Areas, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1967.

O'Toole, R., "Implementing New Science Programs," Science and Children, Volume 12, Number 3, November/December, 1974, pp. 24-25.

Papalia, A., "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Current Trends in French Language Instruction," The Canadian Modern Language Review, Volume 33, Number 3, January, 1977, pp. 344-347.

Parker, D.V., "Study Eleven: Teacher Program Attitudes, Pre- and In-Service Preparation, and Priorities in the French Curriculum," in: An Assessment of the Program in French as a Second Language (Monograph), University of Alberta, 1975, pp. 11:1-4, 13:35.

Passalacqua, B.J., Teacher Job Satisfaction Based on the Herzberg Theory, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1970.

Pellegrin, R.J., Professional Satisfaction and Decision-Making in the Multi-unit School (Monograph), Eugene, Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.

Peterson, P.L.; Marx, R.W.; Clark, C.M., "Teacher Planning, Teacher Behavior, and Student Achievement," American Educational Research Journal, Volume 15, Number 3, Summer, 1978, pp. 417-432.

Pidgeon, D.A., "A Comparative Study of Basic Attainments," Educational Research, Volume 1, Number 1, November, 1958, pp. 50-68.

Pidgeon, D.A., Expectation and Pupil Performance, Stockholm, Almquist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1970.

Porter, L.W., "A Study of Perceived Need Satisfaction in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 45, Number 1, February, 1961, pp. 1-10.

Porter, L.W., "Job Attitudes in Management II: Perceived Importance of Needs as a Function of Job Level," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 47, Number 2, April, 1963, pp. 141-148.

Porter, L.W.; Lawler, E.E., Managerial Attitudes and Performance, Homewood, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin Incorporated, 1968.

Porter, L.W.; Lawler, E.E.; Hackman, J.R., Behavior in Organizations, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Pylypiw, J.A., A Description of Classroom Curriculum Development, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1974.

Reeves, J.E., Information Exchange in Secondary School French Textbook Selection, unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of Alberta, 1969.

Remple, A.; Bentley, R.R., "Teacher Morale: Relationship with Selected Factors," Journal of Teacher Education, Volume 21, Number 4, Winter, 1970, pp. 534-439.

Rosenshine, B., Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement, Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971.

Rosenthal, R.; Jacobson, L., Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1968.

Ryans, D.G., "Teacher Behavior Theory and Research: Implications for Teacher Education," in: Teaching: Vantage Points for Study, Hyman, R.T. (ed.), Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott Company, 1968, pp. 32-43.

Santini, B., "Attitudes of Swiss Teachers Towards the study and Planning of the Curriculum," Journal of Curriculum Studies, Volume 5, Number 2, November, 1973, pp. 156-165.

Savignon, S.J., "On the Other Side of the Desk: A Level Look at Teacher Attitudes and Motivation in Secondary Language Learning," Canadian Modern Language Review, Volume 32, Number 3, February, 1976, pp. 295-302.

Saylor, J.G.; Alexander, W.M., Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1954.

Schaffer, R.H., "Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work," Psychological Monographs, Volume 67, Number 14, (364) 1953, pp. 1-29.

Schmidt, G.L., "Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators," Educational Administrators' Quarterly, Volume 12, Number 2, Spring, 1976, pp. 68-86.

Sergiovanni, T., "Factors which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," Journal of Educational Administration, Volume 5, Number 1, May, 1967, pp. 66-82.

Sharma, C.L., Practices in Decision-Making as Related to Satisfaction in Teaching, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1955.

Shirk, E., "The Hidden Curriculum Revisited," Journal of Thought, Volume 11, Number 1, January, 1976, pp.53-57.

Simms, J.J., The Dynamics of the Implementation of Curricular Innovations, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1978.

Simpkins, W.S.; Friesen, D., "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making," The Canadian Administrator, Volume 8, Number 4, January, 1969, pp. 13-16.

Simson, M.; Poncelow, C.; McLure, J., "Attitudes Toward Decision-Making in Instructional Development," Educational Technology, Volume 16, Number 1, January, 1976, pp. 51-53.

Sinks, R.W., Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Organizational and Administrative Decision-Making in a Sampling of Indiana Public Elementary Schools, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Indiana University, 1967.

Skobjak, B.L.N., Perceptions and Attitudes of Staff Members Towards a District-Wide Curriculum Planning Commission, unpublished Ed.D. thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1978.

Smart, J.C., "Institutional Goal and Congruence: A Study of Student, Faculty, and Administration Preferences," Research in Higher Education, Volume 3, Number 3, pp. 285-297.

Smith, H., "Two Kinds of Teaching," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Volume 15, Number 4, Fall, 1975, pp. 3-12.

Smith, P.C.; Kendall, L.M.; Hulin, C.L., The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, Rand McNally and Company, Chicago, 1969.

Solomon, D.; Bezdek, W.E.; Rosenberg, L., Teaching Styles and Learning, Chicago, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1963.

Stern, C.; Keisler, E., "Teacher Attitudes and Attitude Change," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Volume 10, Number 2, Winter, 1977, pp. 63-76.

Symington, D.J.; Fensham, P.J., "Elementary School Teachers' Closed-Mindedness, Attitudes Toward Science, and Congruence With a New Curriculum," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, Volume 13, Number 5, September, 1976, pp. 441-447.

Tamir, P.; Jungwirth, E., "Teaching Objectives in Biology: Priorities and Expectations," Science Education, Volume 56, Number 1, January/March, 1972, pp. 31-39.

Tardif, C., Teacher Perceptions of the Cultural Goal in Second Language Teaching, unpublished M.Ed. thesis. University of Alberta, 1978.

Tom, A., "Teacher Reaction to a Systematic Approach to curriculum Implementation," Curriculum Theory Network, Number 11, Spring, 1973, pp. 86-93.

Truesdell, D.D., A Study of the Relationship between Participation in Decision-Making and the Recognition of the Legitimacy of Administrative Influence, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland, 1978.

Truex, M.H., "Factors Critical to College Teaching Success or Failure," Improving College and University Teaching, Volume 23, Number 4, Winter, 1975, pp. 236-238.

Vroom, V.H., Work and Motivation, New York, Wiley, 1964.

Vroom, V.H., Motivation in Management, New York, American Foundation for Management Research, 1965.

Vroom, V.H.; Deci, E.L. (editors), Management and Motivation, Kingsport, Tennessee, Penguin Books, 1970.

Walker, D.F.; Shaffarzick, J., "Comparing Curricula," Review of Educational Research, Volume 44, Number 1, Winter, 1974, pp. 83-111.

Wanous, J.P.; Lawler, E.E., "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 56, Number 2, April, 1972, pp. 95-105.

Wernimont, P.F., "A Systems View of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume 56, Number 2, 1972, pp. 173-176.

Whitely, T., "A Model for Pre-Implementation Study of Curriculum Programs," Curriculum Theory Network, Number 7, 1971, pp.43-46.

Wickstrom, R.A., "Sources of Teacher Job Satisfaction," The Canadian Administrator, Volume 13, Number 1, October 1973, pp. 1-5.

Young, J.H., The Curriculum Decision-Making Preferences of Alberta School Personnel, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 1977.

Young, J.H., "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making: An Organizational Dilemma," Curriculum Inquiry, Volume 9, Number 2, Summer 1979, pp. 113-127.

Yuskiewicz, V.D., Pupil Control Ideology and Job Satisfaction in Public School Teachers, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

Yuskiewicz, V.D.; Willower, D.J., "Perceived Pupil Control Ideology Concensus and Teacher Job Satisfaction," Urban Education, Volume 8, Number 3, October 1973, pp. 231-238.

Dans la même série:

B-1 *L'utilisation de l'ordinateur en lexicométrie.*
Savard, Jean-Guy

B-2 *L'ordinateur et l'analyse grammaticale.*
Mepham, Michael S.

B-3 *Concept Categories as Measures of Culture Distance.*
Mackey, William F.

B-4 *L'université bilingue.*
Verdoodt, Albert

B-5 *La rentabilité des mini-langues.*
Mackey, William F.

B-6 *The Computer in Automated Language Teaching.*
Mackey, William F.

B-7 *The Three-Fold Objective of the Language Reform in Mainland China in the Last Two Decades.*
Chiu, Rosaline Kwan-wai

B-8 *Un test télévisé.*
Savard, Jean-Guy

B-9 *Sociolinguistic History, Sociolinguistic Geography and Bilingualism.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-10 *Mathematical Models for Balkan Phonological Convergence.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-11 *Stability of a Bilingual Situation and Arumanian Bilingualism.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-12 *More on Informational Entropy, Redundancy and Sound Change.*
Afendras, Evangelos A. & Tzannes, Nicolaos S.

B-13 *Relations entre anglophones et francophones dans les syndicats québécois.*
Verdoodt, Albert

B-14 *Multilingual Communication in Nigeria.*
Iso, Asi Otu & Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-15 *The Language Factor in Maori Schooling.*
Richards, Jack C.

B-16 *Diffusion Processes in Language: prediction and planning.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-17 *A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis.*
Richards, Jack C.

B-18 *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: a report.*
Kloss, Heinz & Verdoodt, Albert

B-19 *Interference, Integration and the Synchronic Fallacy.*
Mackey, William F.

B-20 *A Psycholinguistic Measure of Vocabulary Selection.*
Richards, Jack C.

B-21 *A Pilot Study on the Ability of Young Children and Adults to Identify and Reproduce Novel Speech Sounds.*
Afendras, Evangelos A., Yeni-Komshian, G. & Zubin, David A.

B-22 *Can One Measure a Sprachbund? A Calculus of Phonemic Distribution for Language Contact.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-23 *Stochastic Processes for Diachronic Linguistics.*
Afendras, Evangelos A. & Tzannes, Nicolaos S.

B-24 *Structures ethniques et linguistiques au Burundi, pays 'unimodal' typique.*
Verdoodt, Albert

B-25 *Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies.*
Richards, Jack C.

B-26 *Graduate Education in Foreign Language Teaching.*
Mackey, William F.

B-27 *La question scolaire en Alsace: statut confessionnel et bilinguisme.*
Kauffmann, Jean

B-28 *Polychronometry: the study of time variables in behavior.*
Mackey, William F.

B-29 *Diglossie au Québec: limites et tendances actuelles.*
Chantefort, Pierre

B-30 *Literary Biculturalism and the Thought-Language-Culture Relation.*
Mackey, William F.

B-32 *La distance interlinguistique.*
Mackey, William F.

B-33 *Options politiques fondamentales de l'état plurilingue.*
Plourde, Gaston

B-34 *Social Factors, Interlanguage and Language Learning.*
Richards, Jack C.

B-35 *Analyse des erreurs et grammaire générative: la syntaxe de l'interrogation en français.*
Py, Bernard

B-36 *Anglicization in Quebec City.*
Edwards, Vivien

B-37 *La lexicométrie allemande: 1898-1970.*
Njock, Pierre-Emmanuel

B-39 *Individualisation de l'enseignement et progrès continu à l'élémentaire. Application à l'anglais, langue seconde.*
Bégin, Y., Masson, J.P., Beaudry, R. & Paquet, D. (INRS-Education)

B-41 *Une communauté allemande en Argentine: Eldorado.*
Micolis, Marisa

B-42 *Three Concepts for Geolinguistics.*
Mackey, William F.

B-43 *Some Formal Models for the Sociology of Language: diffusion, prediction and planning of change.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-45 *Le projet de restructuration scolaire de l'île de Montréal et la question linguistique au Québec.*
Duval, Lise & Tremblay, Jean-Pierre; recherche dirigée par Léon Dion avec la collaboration de Micheline de Sève.

B-46 *L'écologie éducationnelle du bilinguisme.*
Mackey, William F.

B-47 *La situation du français comme langue d'usage au Québec.*
Gendron, Jean-Denis

B-48 *Network Concepts in the Sociology of Language.*
Afendras, Evangelos A.

B-49 *Attitude linguistique des adolescents francophones du Canada.*
Gagnon, Marc

B-50 *Vers une technique d'analyse de l'enseignement de l'expression orale.*
Huot-Tremblay, Diane

B-51 *A Demographic Profile of the English Population of Quebec 1921-1971.*
Caldwell, Gary

B-52 *Language in Education and Society in Nigeria: a comparative bibliography and research guide.*
Brann, C.M.B.

B-53 *Eléments de correction phonétique du français.*
LeBel, Jean-Guy

B-54 *Langue, dialecte et diglossie littéraire.*
Mackey, William F.

B-55 *Rapport de synthèse de l'élaboration du test d'anglais langue seconde.*
GREDIL (Groupe de recherche et d'étude en didactique des langues)

B-56 *Relations interethniques et problèmes d'acculturation.*
Abou, Sélim

B-57 *Etude socio-linguistique sur l'intégration de l'immigrant allemand au milieu québécois.*
Hardt-Dhatt, Karin

B-58 *La culture politique du Mouvement Québec Français.*
Turcotte, Denis

B-59 *Aspects sociolinguistiques du bilinguisme canadien.*
Saint-Jacques, Bernard

B-60 *Cooperation and Conflict in Dual Societies: a comparison of French-Canadian and Afrikaner nationalism.*
Novek, Joël

B-61 *Le Zaïre: deuxième pays francophone du monde?*
Faïk, Sully; Pierre, Max; N'Tita, Nyembwe & N'Sial, Sesep

B-62 *7e Colloque 1976 — Actes / 7th Symposium 1976 — Proceedings.*
Association canadienne de linguistique appliquée /
Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics

B-63 *Les dispositions juridico-constitutionnelles de 147 Etats en matière de politique linguistique.*
Turi, Giuseppe

B-64 *Contribution à l'étude du problème de la difficulté en langue étrangère.*
Ragusich, Nicolas-Christian

B-65 *Linguistic Tensions in Canadian and Belgian Labor Unions.*
Verdoodt, Albert

B-66 *Contribution à l'étude de la nouvelle immigration libanaise au Québec.*
Abou, Sélim

B-67 *L'incidence de l'âge dans l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde.*
Daigle, Monique

B-68 *The Contextual Revolt in Language Teaching.*
Mackey, William F.

B-69 *La langue française en Afrique occidentale francophone.*
Kwofie, Emmanuel N.

B-70 *Motivational Characteristics of Francophones Learning English.*
Clément, Richard

B-71 *Schedules for Language Background, Behavior and Policy Profiles.*
Mackey, William F.

B-72 *Difficultés phonétiques de l'acquisition du français, langue seconde.*
Huot, France

B-73 *Multilinguisme et éducation au Nigéria.*
Brann, C.M.B.

B-74 *Les systèmes approximatifs et l'enseignement des langues secondes.*
High Locastro, Virginia

B-75 *Le bilinguisme canadien: bibliographie analytique et guide du chercheur.*
Mackey, William F.

B-76 *Un siècle de colloques sur la didactique des langues.*
Mackey, William F.

B-77 *L'irrédentisme linguistique: une enquête témoin.*
Mackey, William F.

B-78 *Babel: perspectives for Nigeria.*
Simpson, Ekundayo

P-79 *Samuel Beckett: traducteur de lui-même.*
Simpson, Ekundayo

B-80 *8e Colloque 1977 – Actes / 8th Symposium 1977 – Proceedings.*
Association canadienne de linguistique appliquée /
Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics

B-81 *Language Survey for Nigeria.*
Osaji, Bede

B-82 *L'univers familier de l'enfant africain.*
Njock, Pierre-Emmanuel

B-83 *The Social Psychology of Inter-ethnic Contact and Cross-cultural Communication: An Annotated Bibliography.*
Desrochers, Alain & Clément, Richard

B-84 *Géographie du français et de la francité en Louisiane.*
Breton, Roland J.-L.

B-85 *Etude morphosyntaxique du parler acadien de la Baie Sainte-Marie, Nouvelle-Ecosse (Canada).*
Gesner, B. Edward

B-86 *Multinational Schools as Language Learning Media.*
Mackey, William F.

B-87 *Translating in the Nigerian Mass Media: A Sociolinguistic Study.*
Simpson, Ekundayo

B-88 *Identité culturelle et francophonie dans les Amériques (III).*
Baudot, Alain, Jaubert, Jean-Claude & Sabourin, Ronald

B-89 *Les banques de terminologie bilingues et multilingues: Etat de la question.*
Rondeau, Guy

B-90 *Differences in Earnings by Language Groups in Quebec, 1970: An Economic Analysis.*
Vaillancourt, François

B-91 *The Role of France, Quebec and Belgium in the Revival of French in Louisiana Schools.*
Gold, Gerald L.

B-92 *L'éducation des enfants de travailleurs migrants en Europe occidentale (Bibliographie sélective).*
Rosseel, Eddy

B-93 *La distance interlinguistique lexicale.*
Huot, Jean-Claude

B-94 *Le français parlé: analyse des attitudes des adolescents de la ville de Québec selon les classes sociales.*
Noël, Dany (Danièle)

B-95 *Bilingualism and Linguistic Segregation in the Schools of Brussels.*
Elizabeth Sherman Swing

B-96 *Apprentissage dans des contextes bilingues.*
Rodrigue Landry

B-97 *Exogamie et anglicisation dans les régions de Montréal, Hull, Ottawa et Sudbury.*
Castonguay, Charles

B-98 *The Measurement of Language Diversity.*
Brougham, James

B-99 *Compte-rendu du colloque sur 'Les mécanismes psychologiques sous-jacents à l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde'.*
Présentation: Jean-Denis Gendron & Richard Vigneault

B-100 *The Uneasy Status of Literature in Second Language Teaching at the School Level: An Historical Perspective.*
Schloss, Brigitte

B-101 *Difficultés d'apprentissage de la langue seconde chez l'immigrant adulte en situation scolaire: Une étude dans le contexte québécois.*
d'Anglejan, Alison

B-102 *Une analyse phonologique d'un parler acadien de la Nouvelle-Ecosse (Canada). (Région de la Baie Sainte-Marie).*
Ryan, Robert W.

B-103 *Problèmes en enseignement fonctionnel des langues.*
Actes du 1er colloque sur la didactique des langues
Alvarez, Gerardo & Huot, Diane

B-104 *Le processus du retour au connu dans la classe de langue.*
Boulouffe, Jacqueline

B-105 *Le français parlé en situation minoritaire.* (Volume I).
Mougeon, Raymond

B-106 *Une analyse morphologique du groupe verbal du parler franco-acadien de la région de la Baie Sainte-Marie, Nouvelle-Ecosse (Canada).*
Ryan, Robert W.

B-107 *Bilinguisme et traduction au Canada. Rôle sociolinguistique du traducteur.*
Juhel, Denis

B-108 *A Practical Application of a Study of Errors of College Francophone Students Learning English.*
Godin, Louise

B-109 *Politique linguistique et modalités d'application en Polynésie française. Vers l'implantation du bilinguisme officiel français-tahitien.*
Turcotte, Denis

B-110 *Méthodologie de la classe de conversation: vers un enseignement de la compétence à communiquer.*
Perez, Marcel

B-111 *Codes linguistiques et alternance de codes: étude sociolinguistique du comportement verbal d'immigrants hollandais à Calgary.*
Van't Bosch, Agnès

AUTRES PUBLICATIONS DU C.I.R.B.

Série A — Etudes/Studies (Presses de l'Université Laval)

*A-1 SAVARD, Jean-Guy et RICHARDS, Jack C. *Les indices d'utilité du vocabulaire fondamental français.* Québec, 1970, 172 p.

A-2 KLOSS, Heinz. *Les droits linguistiques des Franco-Américains aux Etats-Unis.* Québec, 1971, 84 p.

A-3 FALCH, Jean. *Contribution à l'étude du statut des langues en Europe.* Québec, 1973, 284 p.

A-4 DORION, Henri & MORISSONNEAU, Christian (colligés et présentés/editors). *Les noms de lieux et le contact des langues / Place Names and Language Contact.* Québec, 1972, 374 p.

A-5 LAFORGE, Lorne. *La sélection en didactique analytique.* Québec, 1972, 383 p.

A-6 TOURET, Bernard. *L'aménagement constitutionnel des Etats de peuplement composite.* Québec, 1973, 260 p.

A-7 MEPHAM, Michael S. *Computation in Language Text Analysis.* Québec, 1973, 234 p.

A-8 CAPPON, Paul. *Conflit entre les Néo-Canadiens et les francophones de Montréal.* Québec, 1974, 288 p.

A-9 SAVARD, Jean-Guy & VIGNEAULT, Richard (présentation/presentation). *Les états multilingues: problèmes et solutions / Multilingual Political Systems: problems and solutions.* Textes de la Table Ronde de 1972/Papers of the Round Table in 1972. Québec, 1975, 591 p.

A-10 BRETON, Roland J.-L. *Atlas géographique des langues et des ethnies de l'Inde et du subcontinent.* Québec, 1976, 648 p.

A-11 SNYDER, Emile & VALDMAN, Albert (présentation). *Identité culturelle et francophonie dans les Amériques.* Québec, 1976, 290 p.

A-12 DARBELNET, Jean. *Le français en contact avec l'anglais en Amérique du Nord.* Québec, 1976, 146 p.

A-13 MALLEA, John R. (compiled and edited). *Quebec's Language Policies: background and response.* Québec, 1977, 309 p.

A-14 DORAIS, Louis-Jacques. *Lexique analytique du vocabulaire inuit moderne au Québec-Labrador.* Québec, 1978, 136 p.

A-15 CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME / INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON BILINGUALISM. *Minorités linguistiques et interventions: Essai de typologie / Linguistic Minorities and Interventions: Towards a Typology.* Compte rendu du Colloque sur les minorités linguistiques tenu à l'Université Laval du 15 au 18 avril 1977 / Proceedings of the Symposium on Linguistic Minorities held at Laval University from April 15th to April 18th 1977. Québec, 1978, 318 p.

*Epuisé / Out of print

A-16 SAVARD, Jean-Guy & LAFORGE, Lorne. *Actes du 5e Congrès de l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée / Proceedings of the 5th Congress of l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée.* Québec, 1981, 464 p.

A-17 TURCOTTE, Denis. *La politique linguistique en Afrique francophone: une étude comparative de la Côte d'Ivoire et de Madagascar.* Québec, 1981, 219 p.

A-100 EQUIPE DE PROFESSEURS DE L'UNIVERSITE LAVAL. *Test Laval: formule A, classement en français langue seconde.* Québec, 1971, Copie échantillon/Sample copy.

A-101 EQUIPE DE PROFESSEURS DE L'UNIVERSITE LAVAL. *Test Laval: formule B, formule C, classement en français langue seconde.* Québec, 1976, Copie échantillon/Sample copy.

Série C — Publications extérieures/Outside publications

C-1 SAVARD, Jean-Guy. *La valence lexicale.* Paris, Didier, 1970, 236 p.

C-2 MACKEY, William F. *Le bilinguisme: phénomène mondial / Bilingualism as a World Problem.* Montréal, Harvest House, 1967, 119 p.

C-3 MACKEY, William F., SAVARD, Jean-Guy & ARDOUIN, Pierre. *Le vocabulaire disponible du français.* Montréal, Didier Canada, 1971, 2 volumes, 900 p.

C-4 STERN, H.H. (rédacteur). *L'enseignement des langues et l'écolier. Rapport d'un colloque international.* (Traduit au CIRB sous la direction de William F. Mackey). Hambourg, Institut de l'UNESCO pour l'éducation, 1971, 254 p.

C-5 KLOSS, Heinz. *Laws and Legal Documents Relating to Problems of Bilingual Education in the United States.* Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971, 92 p.

C-6 MACKEY, William F. *Principes de didactique analytique.* (Révisé et traduit par Lorne Laforge). Paris, Didier, 1972, 713 p.

C-7 MACKEY, William F. & VERDOODT, Albert (editors). *The Multinational Society.* Rowley (Mass.), Newbury House, 1975, 388 p.

C-8 GIORDAN, Henri & RICARD, Alain (sous la direction). *Diglossie et littérature.* Bordeaux-Talence, Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1976, 184 p.

C-9 MACKEY, William F. *Bilinguisme et contact des langues.* Paris, Klincksieck, 1976, 539 p.

C-10 MACKEY, William F., ORNSTEIN, Jacob & al. *The Bilingual Education Movement: essays on its progress.* El Paso, Texas Western Press, 1977, 153 p.

C-11 MACKEY, William F., & ORNSTEIN, Jacob (editors). *Sociolinguistic Studies in Language Contact.* The Hague, Mouton, 1979, 460 p.

Collection *Studies in Bilingual Education* (Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.)
W.F. Mackey — General Editor

C-100 MACKEY, William F. *Bilingual Education in a Binational School: a study of equal language maintenance through free alternation.* 1972, 185 p.

C-101 SPOLSKY, Bernard (editor). *The Language Education of Minority Children: selected readings.* 1972, 200 p.

C-102 LAMBERT, Wallace E. & TUCKER, G. Richard. *Bilingual Education of Children: the St. Lambert experiment.* 1972, 248 p.

C-103 COHEN, Andrew D. *A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education: Experiments in the American Southwest.* 1975, 352 p.

C-104 GAARDER, A. Bruce. *Bilingual Schooling and the Survival of Spanish in the United States.* 1977, 238 p.

C-105 KLOSS, Heinz. *The American Bilingual Tradition.* 1977, 347 p.

C-106 MACKEY, William F. & ANDERSSON, Theodore. *Bilingualism in Early Childhood.* 1977, 443 p.

C-107 MACKEY, William F. & BEEBE, Von-Nieda. *Bilingual Schools for a Bicultural Community.* 1977, 223 p.

Série E — Inventaires/Inventories (Presses de l'Université Laval)

E-1 KLOSS, Heinz & McCONNELL, Grant D. (rédacteurs/editors). *Composition linguistique des nations du monde.* Vol. 1: *L'Asie du Sud: secteurs central et occidental / Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World.* Vol. 1: *Central and Western South Asia.* Québec, 1974, 408 p.

E-2 KLOSS, Heinz & McCONNELL, Grant D. (rédacteurs/editors). *Composition linguistique des nations du monde.* Vol. 2: *L'Amérique du Nord / Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World.* Vol. 2: *North America.* Québec, 1978, 893 p.

E-3 KLOSS, Heinz & McCONNELL, Grant D. (rédacteurs/editors). *Composition linguistique des nations du monde.* Vol. 3: *L'Amérique centrale et l'Amérique du Sud / Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World.* Vol. 3: *Central and South America.* Québec, 1979, 564 p.

E-4 KLOSS, Heinz & McCONNELL, Grant D. (rédacteurs/editors). *Composition linguistique des nations du monde.* Vol. 4: *L'océanie / Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World.* Vol. 4: *Oceania.* Québec, 1981, p.

E-10 KLOSS, Heinz & McCONNELL, Grant D. (rédacteurs/editors). *Les langues écrites du monde: relevé du degré et des modes d'utilisation.* Vol. 1: *Les Amériques / The Written Languages of the World: a survey of the degree and modes of use.* Vol. 1: *The Americas.* Québec, 1978, 633 p.

Série F — Bibliographies (Presses de l'Université Laval)

F-1 SAVARD, Jean-Guy. *Bibliographie analytique de tests de langue / Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests.* Québec, 2e éd., 1977, 570 p.

*F-2 CHIU, Rosaline Kwan-wai. *Language Contact and Language Planning in China (1900-1967). A Selected Bibliography.* Québec, 1970, 276 p.

F-3 MACKEY, William F. (rédacteur/editor). *Bibliographie internationale sur le bilinguisme / International Bibliography on Bilingualism.* Québec, 1972, 757 p.

F-4 AFENDRAS, Evangelos A. & PIANAROSA, Albertina. *Bibliographie analytique du bilinguisme chez l'enfant et de son apprentissage d'une langue seconde / Child Bilingualism and Second Language Learning: a descriptive bibliography.* Québec, 1975, 401 p.

F-5 GUNAR, Daniel. *Contact des langues et bilinguisme en Europe orientale: bibliographie analytique / Language Contact and Bilingualism in Eastern Europe: analytical bibliography.* Québec, 1979, 391 p.

*Epuisé / Out of print

Série G — Rapports de recherche, conférences, communications et articles

G-1 *Le français parlé dans la ville de Québec une étude sociolinguistique.*
Deshaies, Denise

G-2 *Second-language acquisition: An investigation of a bicultural excursion experience.*
Desrochers, Alain & Gardner, Robert, C.

G-3 *Etude des comportements langagiers dans deux entreprises en début de processus de francisation.*
Deshaies, Denise & Hamers, Josiane F.

Adresses des distributeurs / Distributors' addresses

Séries A, E, F:

PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITE LAVAL,
C.P. 2447,
Québec, Québec,
Canada. G1K 7R4

INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARLY BOOK SERVICES INC.,
P.O. Box 555,
Forest Grove,
Oregon 97116, USA

CLUF/L'ECOLE,
11, rue de Sèvres,
75006 Paris,
France

Séries, B, G:

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME,
Pavillon Casault, 6e sud,
Université Laval,
Québec, Québec,
Canada G1K 7P4

B-40, B-44, B-62, B-80:

SECRETARIAT DE L'ACLA,
Université de Montréal,
C.P. 6128, succursale A,
Montréal H3C 3J7

C-1, C-3, C-6:

MARCEL DIDIER LIMITEE,
2050, rue Bleury, suite 500,
Montréal, Québec,
Canada, H3A 2J4

C-2:

HARVEST HOUSE LIMITED,
4795 ouest, rue Sainte-Catherine,
Montréal, Québec,
Canada, H3Z 2B9

C-4:

INSTITUT DE L'UNESCO POUR L'EDUCATION,
Feldbrunnenstrasse 70,
Hambourg 13,
West Germany

APPROVISIONNEMENTS ET SERVICES CANADA,
Ottawa, Ontario,
Canada, K1A 0S9

C-5:

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS,
1611 North Kent Street,
Arlington,
Virginia 22209, USA

C-7, C-100, C-101, C-102, C-103, C-104, C-105, C-106, C-107:

NEWBURY HOUSE PUBLISHERS,
68 Middle Road,
Rowley,
Massachusetts 01969, USA

DIDACTA,
3465, Côte-des-Neiges, suite 61,
Montréal, Québec,
Canada, H3H 1T7

C-8: *MAISON DES SCIENCES DE L'HOMME,*
ILTAM,
Esplanade des Antilles,
Domaine universitaire,
33405 Talence,
France

CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME,
Pavillon Casault, 6e sud,
Université Laval,
Québec, Québec,
Canada, G1K 7P4

C-9: *LIBRAIRIE KLINCKSIECK,*
11, rue de Lille,
75007 Paris,
France

C-10: *TEXAS WESTERN PRESS,*
University of Texas,
El Paso,
Texas 79968, USA

C-11: *MOUTON PUBLISHERS,*
Noordeinde 41
2514 GC La Haye
(Netherlands)